AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. VII.—NOVEMBER, 1892.—NO. 5.

THE THEODICY OF ARISTOTLE.

Die aristotelische Auffassung vom Verhältnisse Gottes zur Welt und zum Menschen. Von Dr. Eugen Rolfes.—Berlin, Mayer & Müller, 1892.

THE account frequently given in books treating of philosophy and the history of philosophy, of the theodicy of Plato and Aristotle; of the part, viz., which treats of the relations of God to the world and man, has always produced an unpleasant impression in my mind. It has seemed so inconsistent with other parts of the metaphysics and theology of these illustrious sages, and so very unreasonable, that I have been inclined to suspect a misunderstanding of these ancient philosophers. Two summers ago, I devoted a part of my vacation at Lake George to a study of the works of Archbishop Satolli,—not very light reading for the summer, one may well imagine. I was agreeably surprised to find that this deep and original thinker positively affirms that Plato has been misinterpreted. He does not go into the question at length, but merely throws out some most interesting observations by the way. Of course a thorough investigation and treatment of the subject would be most desirable. Perhaps Dr. Rolfes, whose work we propose here in part to review, will take a hint and give us another treatise on Plato's theodicy. For the present, he has only taken up the theodicy of Aristotle, which he has discussed in a most able and ingenious manner, as every competent critic will admit, even if he does not agree with his conclusions.

The most serious fault which Christian philosophers find in the

systems of Plato and Aristotle is this : they ascribe to them the erroneous and fundamentally false doctrine that matter and the world are only partially dependent from God, and are in a very essential sense independent of Him in respect to origin and nature. The errors ascribed to them are widely different from each other. To Plato is ascribed the doctrine that the first matter which is subjacent to all forms is eternally self-existent. The work of God consists in impressing ideas upon this pre-existing subject, by the exercise of intelligence and volition. He is the Architect and First Cause of the world as an ordered universe ; its Sovereign Lord and Final Cause ; but not its first efficient cause of being, *i. e.*, its Creator.

Setting aside for the present the last mentioned topic, I pass on to the consideration of the doctrine of Aristotle and the exposition of the views of Dr. Rolfes upon this head.

To Aristotle is ascribed the doctrine that not only the primal matter, prescinding from its forms, but the forms also, the universe with all its substances and their accidents, must be regarded as not depending from God as first and efficient cause, but, consequently, as self-originated. This idea shuts out the relation of God to the world, not only as its Creator but also as its Architect. Moreover, according to this view of Aristotle's doctrine, God not only does not construct and govern the world by an act of intelligence and volition ; He does not even know of its existence, being wholly absorbed in self-contemplation, a contemplation which excludes all possibility of attending to any inferior object. The relation of God to the world is only the relation of final cause. All motion from potential to actual existence is the effect of an unconscious, necessary, physical attraction ; which diffuses itself from its centre in the divine essence through all grades of beings from the highest to the lowest, keeping them in a whirl of activity which has had no beginning and will have no end.

Such is the common representation of the Aristotelian theodicy. And, in connection with it, is the denial that the doctrine of the soul's immortality has any place in the philosophy of Aristotle.

Now, it is evident that such a view as this casts a very dark shadow on the reputation of Aristotle as a philosopher, and throws no little discredit on the schoolmen who acknowledged him as the prince of pagan sages, as well as on their system, in great measure derived from him. It discredits human reason and rational philosophy in general. It makes a breach in the wall for traditionalists. For, if Plato could not discover the relation of the world

to God as absolute First Cause, and Aristotle could not even perceive that order in the universe demands an intelligent architect, they have a plausible argument in favor of their thesis that human reason cannot construct a solid rational theodicy unless its premises and principles are disclosed by revelation.

It is impossible to question the high interest and importance of the work which Dr. Rolfes has undertaken, and, whatever may be the judgment of Catholic philosophers on his success in proving his points, no one who reads his brochure will deny that he has argued the case with subtlety and ability.

Before proceeding to give an abstract of his principal arguments I will enumerate his several theses and the propositions which he has undertaken to defend.

FIRST THESIS.

The movement of the world reduced to act by God as Final Cause and Efficient Principle.

1.—God the Final Cause of the world.

2.—God the Efficient Principle of the order of the world.

The second point is proved

(*a.*)—From the concept of the immovable mover, in the Physics of Aristotle.

(*b.*)—From the concept of pure actuality and other determinations in the last five chapters of the Metaphysics.

(*c.*)—From single utterances.

(*d.*)—From the intrinsic impossibility of the hypothesis of the omnipotence of the Final Cause.

SECOND THESIS.

The position of Aristotle in respect to the doctrine of creation.

1.—God, according to Aristotle's theory, the Author of the being of all things.

2.—The bringing of all things into being by creation, partly grounded in Aristotelian principles, partly, not intentionally, excluded.

3.—The same notion very closely approached in the doctrine respecting the origin of the rational soul and the celestial spheres.

4.—Nevertheless, this notion is not evolved into a perfectly true concept, nor employed in a logically consequent manner.

THIRD THESIS.

PROVIDENCE.

1.—The divine knowledge.

2.—The divine will.

3.—God's liberty and universal providence.

There are two more theses, one relating to psychology and one to ethics, which I pass over for the present, in order to give exclusive attention to theodicy.

ARGUMENT ON THE FIRST THESIS.

That Aristotle teaches the doctrine that God is the Final Cause of all being and movement in the universe is admitted by all ; so that in this respect his theory is in perfect harmony with the Catholic philosophy.

The proposition that he ascribes to God efficient causality in producing the order of the world is denied by many, and, therefore, needs to be proved. It is maintained that Aristotle proposes the theorem that God is the Final Cause, the last end of the world, in order to make intelligible the notion that He produces the course of nature without any active, efficient energy.

It is well known that Aristotle teaches the necessity of a primal source and origin of all movement, which is itself immovable. He argues that every active cause of motion which is itself subject to motion, must have the principle of motion not in itself but outside of itself. Therefore, you must trace all motion which is transmitted by intermediate movers back to a first mover which is at rest, in so far as any motion received from without is concerned. When he comes to explain how all movement begins from the immovable, he defines it as the ultimate object, the end, toward which all things tend by their movements. As the good and the true move the will and the intellect, so the First Mover moves all things as the object of love, first and immediately the beings who are nearest to Him, and through them in a descending series those which are more distant. It follows from this, say our opponents, that Aristotle denies active energy and working to the Godhead, and recognizes in it no outward influence except after the manner of a final cause,

as a quiescent, inactive end toward which all movement tends. They say also that this position is rendered indisputable by explicit affirmations of Aristotle that the life of God is not active but contemplative. Besides, according to Aristotle, God knows nothing of the world, thinks and knows Himself alone. Any turning from self-contemplation to the consideration of creatures would be inconsistent with His immutability and an unworthy occupation of His intelligence.

This is the principle argument of the opponents of Dr. Rolfes' thesis, and he begins his contrary argument precisely from this point, *i. e.*, he begins to prove his proposition that Aristotle ascribes efficient causality to God, from his doctrine respecting God as Final Cause. There is no doubt whatever that a valid and unanswerable argument for the truth that God is the First Efficient Cause of all being outside of Himself by intelligence and will can be drawn from premises contained in the doctrine of final causes. In fact, Janet has most conclusively proved the fundamental truths of philosophical theism by this process in his admirable treatise on "Final Causes." But the precise question is, whether Aristotle perceived and has expressed this conclusion : viz. that the last final cause must necessarily be first efficient cause.

There is nothing more explicitly and frequently affirmed by Aristotle than the principle that all movement in nature must be referred ultimately to the first moving cause which is the source and origin of all movement, moving all things by its intrinsic energy, and not itself the subject of any movement produced from within or from without its own essence. By movement or motion is not meant mere change of place, like the transit of a body from one part of space to another, but all change whatever, or to speak with metaphysical accuracy, all transition from mere passive potency or active power into act. There is no transition from mere potency into act, without the influence of that which is already in act. The potency of a ball to be propelled is inactive without a propelling force. The propelling power of the bat and the ball-player is inactive, until the energy of the ball-player is actually exercised. The capacity of development in a plant or animal is quiescent until active forces are brought to bear on the subject of their action. The mere power to make a statue or a poem produces nothing. A soul capable of thinking and willing, but quiescent, as in infancy, sleep, or idiocy, is not *ipso facto* an intelligent and free agent, but must be awakened to thought and volition by some influence proceeding

either from some other part of the subject himself, or from some external agent. The transition from not being into being is a movement, a passage from potentiality into act. All beings who have in themselves a mixture of act and potency, who do not exist by the necessity of their own nature, but are only by this intrinsic necessity possible, must make this transit from potency into act. The mere passive potency cannot of itself produce the act; for nothing can come of nothing. All movements require a mover, and even if, *per impossibile*, you suppose the number of beings in act to be infinite, and the series of successive movements to have no beginning, you cannot account for transit out of potency into act without rising above the whole multitude of effects and causes, to the prime mover, the First Cause, who is above the whole series, and logically if not chronologically prior to all. This first being and first cause must be pure act, without any mixture of potentiality. Such a Being is God, according to Theistic and Christian philosophy, and according to the philosophy of Aristotle. No one can deny that Aristotle taught the origin of the world and all beings in it from God, and the dependence of all second causes from the First Cause. It is true that he held the universe to be boundless, and the number of its individual beings to be infinite; moreover, that it had no beginning and will have no end, though subject to continual movements and changes in its particular substances and accidents. But this was only to say that God produced the transit from potential into actual being from eternity, and in an infinite number of terms. Moreover, he held that only the highest and most perfect spirits received their movement immediately from God, while all the inferior beings received it mediately through the action of second causes in a descending series. Yet, it was in virtue of the movement and the active power received from God, that these second causes were enabled to produce their effects. Whether the exercise of the divine energy in producing the world and its movements was necessary or voluntary in God, is a distinct question, which comes up for after-consideration. In either case the position stands firm that God alone is pure act in Himself, and the origin of all passage from potency into act in the universe. The notion of efficient causality is inseparable from this concept. Nevertheless, since Aristotle describes the life of God as one of pure contemplation, and admitting of no intrinsic change or movement from rest to action; since he also represents Him as the object of knowledge and love towards

whom as a Being in repose all intelligent beings tend by their movement, drawing after them all inferior beings; it is confidently asserted that this idea of God as Final Cause excludes the notion of an efficient energy of intelligence and will, especially as a *conscious* activity producing the beings of the world and their movements, and directing them, singly and collectively to a common end.

Aristotle says that God is the first and absolute Intelligible and Loveable, the infinitely True and infinitely Good, and as such moves intelligent spirits, who in turn move all other things. But does this presentation of God as the object of knowledge and desire exclude the concept of God as the efficient cause of the reduction of all beings from potentiality into act? Does the concept of the unchangeable repose of the divine Being in the contemplation of the True and the Good in Himself imply the denial of an active energy of omnipotence in actual, conscious, and intelligent exercise, producing the world? By no means!

Aristotle wishes to prove that the final cause or end, for which God produces the world and its movements is not outside of Himself, but is within Himself, is Himself; that First and Final Cause are one.

The immovable resting of God in the contemplation and love of His own Being as the Truth and the Goodness in its infinite essence, is not in contradiction to a consideration of the true and the good in other beings, whose truth and goodness have their ground and origin in Himself, but only to a consideration whose term is something which has a being separate and independent from Himself. His eternal repose in His own intrinsic, essential beatitude is not in contradiction to an energy and an active working which has its origin, motive and end within Himself; but only to that which is awakened by a power outside of Himself, and for an end not in Himself, but something out of Himself, which He seeks to attain.

There is nothing in all that Aristotle says of God as Final Cause to contradict or weaken the argument previously made for the necessity of a First Cause and a First Mover to explain all the phenomena of change and movement in the universe. All energy and all act, in finite and changeable beings, whose essence implies and contains a potential element requiring an extrinsic force to become actuated, presupposes an energy original and underived, in a Being who is pure Act by his Essence, and unchangeable.

It is impossible to formulate the concept of final causality with-

out introducing the concept of efficient causality. An object cannot tend to another object as its end and goal by movement, unless it is attracted by an efficient force proceeding from the latter, or propelled by a force within itself, or moved by a force exercised by a third subject, independent of both. The magnet makes the iron move toward itself by its own proper attractive force. The earth pulls the moon toward itself by the attraction of gravitation. On the other hand, the train from Washington to Baltimore is driven by the force within the locomotive. The cannon ball is propelled against the wall of the fort by the force of the powder confined within the gun and ignited.

The movement of the world toward God as Final Cause, the end and goal toward which all movement tends, must have an efficient cause either in the Final Cause itself, or in the subject of the motion, or in a third power. The last supposition is excluded by Aristotle's doctrine, a statement which it is wholly unnecessary to prove. If the first supposition is taken, viz., that God, as the ultimate object of knowledge and love, or as Final Cause, is the first principle and last reason of all movement, then He must produce motion toward Himself by attraction, or in other words, He must be the efficient as well as the final Cause of all the complex and orderly movements which take place in the universe, of all transit from the potential to the actual.

On the second supposition, either the world has come to be what it is by chance, or its whole order is self-existent and eternal, or it consists in an infinite series of generations, revolutions, changes of all sorts, a perpetual self-development without beginning or end.

All these notions are shut out by Aristotle's philosophy. He rejects the notion of chance as absurd, the notion likewise of an infinite series of second causes; and although he holds that the spirits of the highest celestial sphere, and the sphere itself are substantially unchangeable and eternal, nevertheless he refers their origin and accidental changes, their intelligence and felicity to the one Principle and Author of all forms, and as they have at least the one movement by which they tend toward God as their Final Cause, the maxim that all movement proceeds from a first mover applies to these as well as to all other beings in the world.

It is plain from all the foregoing that the whole order of the universe, with all its forms and movements, is to be referred to God as Final Cause, and that this relation pre-supposes and demands the exercise of an efficient causality which can only be in God.

The world cannot develop this order with all its movements from itself or under the influence of a third subject; it must be reduced from potency into act, and into action by God himself, as the Author of at least all forms and all exercise of their active powers. God must originate and direct the universal rush of all things toward and around their centre. He cannot do this by a merely physical, mechanical attraction, like a magnet or a sun. For, according to Aristotle, He is by essence the pure Intelligible, and the pure Good or Lovable, which are identical with each other and with the intelligent and loving principle in the most simple and pure act which is the life of God. The action of God in the world must therefore be the action of intelligence and will. He sees the good which can be accomplished in the world by drawing it toward Himself in manifold ways, and He brings this good into actual existence by actually exercising the power of His intelligence and will. That this exercise of efficient causality should be unconscious, and that God should not only be careless of the world which owes its excellent order and perpetual motion to Him, but even be ignorant of its existence, is a notion irreconcilable with the intelligent nature and the intelligent mode of willing which are His essence.

The question whether this exercise be necessary or free is distinct, and requires separate treatment. But it cannot be considered as necessary in a physical, but only in a moral sense; *i. e.*, that God must see by His intelligence what is best, and choose the same; and therefore be unchangeably determined by His wisdom and goodness to produce from eternity the manifold order of the universe, embracing a boundless variety and number of forms. As for the objection that the statements of Aristotle exclude the possibility of a turning of the divine intellect and will from the contemplation and love of the best to the less good, it is worthless. For Aristotle excludes only the notion that God can receive wisdom and felicity from objects outside of Himself, but not the true concept that He sees all possible beings in His own essence, and loves the good which He essentially possesses, as diffusive of itself, from its own fulness, and not as a means of its own increase. In like manner, the objection that Aristotle represents the divine life as an unchangeable repose, and thus excludes the possibility of an active exercise of efficient causality, is equally futile. For it is the notion of a change from repose to activity, of a development of active life in the divine Being, of a laborious effort to accomplish something by which He will become better and richer, which Aristotle deservedly condemns.

There is nothing in this which contradicts the true concept of an activity in God, which implies no change in Him, no passage from rest to action, no laborious effort, no inward need and striving to complete the perfection of His self-sufficing being and beatitude, and which presents the idea of a perfect harmony between the eternal repose and the eternal activity of God in His immanent acts and in those which have an extrinsic term.

There is another consideration which seems most directly and decisively to refute the notion that the action of God on the world is, according to Aristotle, unconscious. It is, namely, that the philosopher teaches that God has, as intelligent, the absolute comprehension of Himself as intelligible. This includes the knowledge of Himself, as the Final Cause of the world, which implies the knowledge of the world itself and its relation to Him as its Final Cause.

There are, also, passages in the works of Aristotle in which he explicitly affirms the intelligent and intentional action of God upon the world as the efficient First Cause of its order.

Speaking of accidental causes of certain effects in the world, he affirms that accidents, even when they have a causal operation, are posterior to intelligence and nature, and that, therefore, no matter how much play chance may have in the construction and movements of the universe "reason and nature must be more originally the cause, as well of much else, as also of the universe which surrounds us." (22. Phys. 6. fin.)

Again, Aristotle says: "God and nature do nothing without a purpose." (De coelo. 1. 4. fin.)

Once more, he says that we cannot deny to God and the good man the power to do evil. For this power does not make them evil, but, as being a power, is good. Upon which Suarez remarks that although Aristotle errs in ascribing to God the power to do evil, he is right inasmuch as he ascribes to Him the power of choosing what He will do. (Top. IV. 5. 126, a. 33, Suar. Disp. Met. 30, 16.)

There is no dualism or recognition of many principles in Aristotle's philosophy. He closes his Metaphysics with a quotation from Homer. "The government of many is never good, let there be one ruler." All the order in the universe and all its movements must be referred to one principle, to God as First and Final Cause.

ARGUMENT ON THE SECOND THESIS.

In the discussion of the Second Thesis, the author undertakes to prove that, according to Aristotle, God is the Author, not only of the order of the universe, but of the first being, also, of all things in it.

In the eighth chapter of the twelfth book of the Metaphysics, Aristotle calls God "the original principle and the first of beings." This statement implies the derivation of all being whatever, not only as to specific and individual determinations, but also as to first being from God.

There are only three ways in which the actual being of the universe with all its forms, active forces, activities and phenomena in general, can be supposed to have its origin and first principle in God. One is that it comes from emanation. This hypothesis is incompatible with one of Aristotle's fundamental doctrines, the absolute immutability, self-sufficing life and beatitude of God.

Another is, that God, as Plato is supposed to have taught, impresses His ideas upon a pre-existing, self-existing first matter, the underlying subject on which He exercises His power as the Architect and Ruler of the universe. This is shut out by the doctrine of Aristotle, that first matter has no being, except what it receives from the actuation of form.

The third is the true concept, which finds its perfect expression in the doctrine of Christian philosophy, that God creates all things out of nothing by the word of His power.

Dr. Rolfes argues at some length, that the true interpretation of Aristotle is that which ascribes to him the doctrine that God is the Author of the whole underlying subject of the determinate being and order of the universe; a doctrine which implies creation.

This proposition has been virtually proved in the argument on the first thesis. It follows directly from the proposition that God is the Author of the order of the universe, that, on Aristotle's principles, He is also the Author of its first being. It is evident, that as the Author of its order, He produces it *ex nihilo sui*. But He produces it, also, *ex nihilo subjecti*. For, according to Aristotle, there is no really existing subject prior to the actuation of *materia prima* by its form. Every being, therefore, which has in it a mixture of potency and act comes into actual existence totally from nothing, by the act of God. It makes a transit from mere possibility into actual being, which is precisely what Aristotle means by the movement which must be caused by the first mover, "the original

principle and first of beings." The philosophy of Aristotle in respect to the relation of the world to God is summed up in the phrase of Homer: "The government of many is not good, let there be one ruler."

But although Aristotle both negatively and positively leads up to the doctrine of creation, he does not expressly formulate it; and if he had done so, there could be no controversy.

Perhaps his shortcoming and silence may be explained in this way. For him, the world was without a beginning in time. On this hypothesis, there was no transition from not being, or nothing, into being. The possible was always nothing in itself but it was always reduced to act by the eternal, causative act of God. Aristotle saw no contradiction in the concept of a world always existing and always receiving all its being from the One who is Being in plentitude, who is before all and by whom all things consist.

But he would not be likely to express the concept of the eternal production of the world *ex nihilo sui et subjecti* by the formula "God created the world out of nothing." This formula implies that we must go back to a beginning of the world which has nothing before it. But the fundamental idea of God, and universal being which is not God, in their relation to each other, is, that the latter is neither an emanation from the former, nor a product of chance, nor yet a self-producing, self-moving satellite of the central Deity, but a universe, all whose being is totally received from God, as its First and Final Cause.

Let this suffice for the present, as an exposition of Aristotle's doctrine on this head.

AUGUSTINE F. HEWIT.

Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

ST. CHARLES BORROMEO AS A PREACHER.

IN one of the rooms of the Ambrosian Library at Milan are to be found several volumes of MS. sermons by St. Charles. They are not all in the neat handwriting of the Saint, but have in great part been supplemented, presumably by the faithful Possevino, who used to take down the words of his holy master whilst he preached. In 1747 the directors of the library published five good-sized quarto volumes of homilies and addresses by the Saint; but there still re-

mained nine folio volumes, "novem ingentes codices propria ejusdem manu, ad conciones, arborum modo, in sua capita veluti ramos distribuendas, exarati asservantur." [1]

The main bulk, therefore, of the unpublished works in the Ambrosian Library consists of sermon sketches from the hand of the holy Archbishop.

From a glance at these sketches, even more than from a study of the finished discourses which have been printed, we may form some estimate of the manner in which St. Charles composed his sermons and addresses; that is to say, how he set about preparing himself for the task of preaching, and how he obtained that marvelous facility which would seem to be a natural gift requiring no forethought in its perfect use. The idea that St. Charles made or required no special preparation for his sermons is excluded by the very existence of the thousands of sketches mentioned above, some of which date close to the end of his life, as is evident from their headings.

That he could not have written out in detail every one of his sermons stands to reason. What he has written is enough to fill an ordinary laborious life; and though he never lost a minute, reading, as Mgr. Fontana[2] assures us, even whilst he was being shaved, still he died comparatively young in a sphere preëminently active and practical which afforded little time for literary work, except at night.

But he preached at every public function in any of the great churches of his diocese where he officiated, and regularly on Sundays in his Cathedral, both morning and evening. This, we know, was the rule, yet he must have preached much oftener when not on visitation, for he begins one of his sermons bearing date February 24, 1584, and delivered at the Cathedral, with the following words: "It is several days, beloved brethren, that I have not seen your faces and you have not heard the voice of your shepherd, because he was prostrate with sickness—the fruit of sin." [3]

If St. Charles possessed any facility in the way of composing, and a certain power in the delivery of his sermons, it must be distinctly attributed to constant and severe mental, moral and physical application, which served partly as a remote, and in part as a proximate

1 Dedicatio ad edit. Homiliar. Mediol. 1747.

2 MS. Bibl. Ambr. G. xxx, p. 52.

3 Hom. vol. iii, p. 385. This was in the year of his death when he had often to be carried on a pallet into the sacristy or church, owing to a wound in his leg, the pain of which, however, did not prevent him from attending personally to his episcopal duties, at least so far as it was compatible with the outward dignity of the sacred ministry.

preparation for his preaching. He had but little actual talent as a speaker; his previous habits, at the time he began to preach, had unfitted him to use that little to advantage; and if supernatural gifts contributed largely to his success as he advanced in his holy career, we cannot forget that these were gained only at the price of ceaseless mortification and self-discipline which compares hardly with the labor of the mere student.

HIS IDEAL OF THE PREACHER'S TASK.

As soon as St. Charles had, from his observations at Rome and Trent, realized the evils of his time which needed cure, he told his clergy that the cause of the moral and social decay around them lay in the fact that the ministry of preaching had been neglected for a long time past. The cause suggested the remedy. The people were still, as ever, eager for the word of truth, but they wanted men to break to them this bread of life. The champions of the so-called Reformation in the North had fully understood this fact and the torrents of their false doctrine were being carried accross the Alps by itinerant preachers who sought and readily found hearers among the neglected multitudes. St. Charles stirred a counter-current. "You know," he says, in one of his addresses to the pastors of Milan, "how grossly this duty of preaching has been neglected and the conscience of many among you must accuse them of their carelessness and indifference. You are the pastors of souls. The word of God is the food of your people. Hearken to me, then, as I point out to you in what manner you are to fulfill this obligation which weighs heavily and continually upon the conscience of a pastor."[1] He then seeks to convince them of the paramount importance of this duty at all times during their practical ministry. *Vae mihi si tacuero! Clama ne cesses!* he calls out with the inspired writers.

In the Constitutions drawn up for the Oblates of St. Ambrose he insists, in burning and beautiful words, upon the lofty dignity, the high prerogative of the preacher. He shows what care of his words and his manner in the pulpit he must take, who is commissioned to announce and interpret a message from the most high King of heaven to the people of earth.

St. Charles deems it the first task of the preacher to convince himself, by reflection, of the greatness of the Master whom he interprets, of the priceless value of the human soul, of the wondrous

1 Synod. Dioces. ii, a. 1568.

effects and personal rewards which await the zeal of him who instructs many unto justice. This is the first requisite to make a priest understand what care is demanded in the preparation of sermons.

In his own case the recognition of the needs of his flock went hand in hand with the conviction of what the value of a good preacher was under the circumstances. He felt, and said it often, that the whole success of the apostolic ministry, nay the vivifying agency of the sacraments in the Church depended on the work of the preacher. This gave the task its supereminent importance and added to its inherent dignity as an instrument of moral regeneration and social reform.[1]

Although St. Charles constantly insisted upon and repeated these sentiments in his conferences with the clergy he found it advisable to put in permanent and easily accessible form the rules and precepts which should guide them in this matter. He accordingly published, shortly after the holding of the Third Provincial Council, a work called *Instructiones praedicationis verbi Dei.* It consists of twenty-six chapters and contains a complete and pithy exposition of the principles and practice of Sacred Rhetoric. Among other useful hints the treatise has a chapter on what would be called in modern parlance *The Don'ts of the Preacher.* With few modifications or in the hands of a practical teacher this book would make an admirable text for our seminarists. The Bishops of France had it reprinted on various occasions for the guidance of the pastoral clergy of their dioceses.

SOURCES.

If the ministry of preaching calls out the dignity of the priest who delivers the message of God with care, it does so not alone by reason of attention to expression and form, but by an inwardly burning flame, which somehow transforms the mere man and acts as an authentic of his mission. It is said of our Lord that "His word was with power,"[2] that His teaching carried with it a wondrous authority "not as that of their scribes and pharisees."[3] Surely the words and expressions of Christ, as His disciples remem-

1. Hujus muneris tanta undique dignitas ostenditur ut non facile aliud excogitari dicive possit, quod illo praestantius sit, aut altius, aut magnificentius, siquidem omnia christianae religionis mysteria et sacramenta . . . . omnia denique quae a Deo ad homines proficiscuntur, et ad Deum proficiscentes homines juvant, verbi divini nomine continentur. Cf. Epitom. Instit. Oblat. Act, V, Lib. iii, c. I.

2 Luc. iv, 32.

3 Matt. vii, 29; Marc. i, 22.

bered them, were exceedingly simple, but the evangelists tell us that the people were astonished and captivated by His *doctrine*, which, though often wholly mysterious, carried conviction into their hearts so that they readily followed Him in simplicity of a faith which they would not accord to their learned scribes.

We hardly need the assurance of the biographers of St. Charles, such as Bescape and Possevino, who knew him intimately and who had listened to his sermons hundreds of times, that he possessed something of the strange fascination, which so markedly distinguishes the lover of God's word from the orator, who, having memorized a well composed discourse, recites it with the ready grace of a practiced art.

The secret of that burning enthusiasm which so readily catches the heart of the hearer, yet makes him at the same time forget the man and feel only the virtue of God in the pulpit, that secret lies almost wholly in the reverent and assiduous study of the Holy Scriptures. Most men need no other argument in favor of the inspiration of the sacred text than the palpable grace which they derive from its thoughtful reading; and whilst this is really no argument of canonicity it contains evidence of the power inherent in the inspired writings. One reason of this, if we attempt to explain it on natural grounds, is that the Sacred Scriptures, from whatever point we may approach them, present *wisdom;* they anticipate the failures and follies of earthly experiments, and the man who had learned the Scripture's precepts in boyhood, who had doubted them in youth and forgotten them in manhood, mostly returns to look for them in old age, unless pride has made him a coward. When our utterance is shaped upon the lines of well defined wisdom it imparts a feeling of safety, of superiority, whose predicates are prudence and fortitude. Almost any study gains our affection in proportion as we enter into its intelligence. In this case the love is turned toward wisdom, not a philosopher's system, but an infallible declaration. The sense of assurance is perfect, yet it is balanced by the consciousness that this wisdom is God's. This thought and feeling are fundamental, and ever repeated in the very text before us; yet as a light it lends us its rays, and we begin to realize simultaneously our power, our dependence, our safety.

It was the conviction and teaching of St. Charles that no study, serving as a remote preparation for the pulpit could better insure that earnestness and power of attraction which lasts long after the

sound of the words has passed away, than the habitual and devout reading of the Sacred Scriptures.

In former days few students of the Bible thought of following their own lights in the interpretation of difficult passages or such as admitted of varied application. The Sacred Scriptures were read simultaneously with the writings of the Fathers, nearly all of whom have extensively written upon the meaning of the sacred text for the guidance of preachers. Hence we find St. Charles insisting much upon the reading of the great Christian Doctors of the Church as accessory to the understanding of the sacred writings.

How closely he himself was devoted to this study is apparent not only from a mere glance at his sermons but especially from an unpublished—we might say unfinished—work in MS. which is the property of the Marquis of Trivulzi and religiously preserved in the family library of that nobleman. It consists of a collection of passages selected from the Bible and from the writings of the Fathers, and grouped in the manner of a concordance. According to his biographers, the Saint had intended to publish this collection under the name of *Sylva Pastoralis* with the wish of aiding his clergy in the preparation of their discourses.

Possevino gives us an interesting glimpse at the way in which the holy Cardinal prepared this and similar works. The two used to work together, and it is pleasant to notice the simplicity of the good secretary who tells us how he used to freeze at nights when reading or writing with the Saint. "It was marvelous" he says, "to witness with what energy he pursued his studies. . . His method was exceedingly practical and fruitful, although very fatiguing to the one who happened to be with him. He would select certain passages of what he was reading with his companion—this was usually myself—which were copied on little papers (polizzini), and immediately arranged under separate headings. At the end of the year they were put in alphabetical order and copied into a book. . . . We sometimes spent a whole hour in getting done with the selection of passages contained on a single page, writing them out under different titles so as to have them ready for use accordingly as time and occasion might call for it. He often used to say to me that this was the true method of study, that is, one should not read too much, but take a little at a time and enter into the sense and digest it."[1]

1 Abbé Sylvain: Histoire de S. C. Chap. xlvii, p. 278.

Nor did St. Charles neglect the study of the profane or classical writers, either ancient or of his own time, in so far as it offered solid and useful material of information. His library which, though not very large, was one of the choicest in Italy, is evidence of his taste and reading habits. Sig. Carlo Cannetta, member of the Lombard Historical Society, speaking of the catalogue of this library, says that many of the volumes were carried off by the revolutionary faction during the time of the French Republic. Indeed, Possevino assures us that the work which, according to the Saint's own statement, exerted a very decided influence upon him in making him abandon secular pursuits and embrace a life of renunciation at the time of Pius IV, was the philosophy of the stoic Epictetus. We know that he was equally fond of Seneca and he often cites the ancient moralists. Among others he possessed fifteen different editions of Ovid and six of Virgil. Besides the well furnished departments of theology, canon law, ascetical and classical works, he had a fine collection of medical books. "For the rest," remarks Sylvain "this library, which reflects the man and his activity, is the library of a distinguished booklover who discards all that is vulgar or commonplace."

St. Charles was, as P. Panigarola has expressed it, a friend and leader of every literary pursuit. To him more than to any other single man do we owe the preservation of what is most valuable, not only in the religious and civic history of Lombardy, but in the Vatican archives which he reorganized during his stay at the papal court. Well have the Milanese recorded his title as a restorer of letters over the entrance of the Brera, which might be called the National Academy:

SCIENTIAE. LITTERATURAE

IN ECCLESIA. SUA. RESTITUTORI

THE FORM.

From a cultivated mind such as that of our Saint, we might suppose that he was not neglectful of form. There is among his letters one in which he corresponds with the gifted and saintly Louis of Granada about a Rhetoric which the latter had promised to publish. St. Charles is anxious to have it as soon as it is printed. He greatly admired the sermons of St. Louis and had them translated as models for his clergy just because they were so perfect in form

as well as in sentiment. Indeed, we find the holy Archbishop troubling the saintly recluse for sermons about the liturgy of the Church, to such an extent that the latter had to put him off by saying that he was hardly able to do any more, being over seventy years of age and in weak health.

But his own work on the subject of preaching, to which we have already referred is very explicit in this regard.

After having shown how necessary it is that the preacher be convinced of the great importance and efficacy of his ministry in the pulpit; how it can never be accomplished successfully without study and careful preparation, he points out the subject matter which is to be taken up during the course of the year in the parochial churches. Next follow four chapters: *De iis quae ad Formam Concionis pertinent* (xxiii), *De Decoro* (xxiv), *De Elocutione Concionatoris* (xxv), *De Voce et Corporis Motu* (xxvi). These chapters contain excellent and practical precepts regarding the method, manner and address of the preacher, in which the Saint points out the faults to be avoided under various forms. He is careful to inculcate attention to the culture of voice and gesture, because he knew from his own experience how difficult it is to supply any deficiency in this respect where it has been neglected during earlier years.

When he had left the University of Pavia he was noticeably timid and consequently awkward. The habitual retirement for several years of student-life, when he rarely took part in any public sport or social amusement had produced that diffidence and shyness which is rarely lost entirely, after it has once grown into the youth when he enters the age of maturity. St. Charles fully realized this defect in himself and knew that it would prejudice his success in preaching, to which now that he had assumed the charge of the Milanese Church he felt bound to devote himself with all his energy.

He studied, and what was better, he practiced the art of delivery. This was one of the primary objects of the so-called *Noctes Vaticanae*, assemblies where men who aimed at intellectual culture gathered to exchange knowledge and cultivate the means of imparting the same to others. The different members of this society made addresses in turn, and in order that there might be perfect liberty of criticism they went under assumed names. In this training school of eloquence there reigned a perfect spirit of fraternal equality coupled with a generous zeal for the common advancement.

Here the Saint learned to overcome that tendency to stammer, which had been noticed by his friends after his return from Pavia.

For several years he could never be induced to preach from the pulpit of the Cathedral, but used to do so in his vestments from the altar, because he believed that he was lacking in that dignified manner and oratorical art which was expected of those who occupied the sacred chair. "The pulpit requires as you know," writes the Saint to Mgr. Ormanetto, his Vicar-general, "action and a good voice, with much preparation." What stress he laid upon proper preparation of this kind is shown, among other things, from the fact that he commissioned the Bishop of Verona, who was a polished man of letters, to compose a rhetoric for the use of the ecclesiastical students in the Milanese Seminary. He himself, however, had traced the outline of this work; for the Bishop on sending it completed to the Saint, writes: "Here is your Rhetoric, which returns to you as to its father . . . Don't wonder if I call you its father, for I have only served as your instrument to prepare it for the press."

It was by assiduous labor in the beginning, and by sustained attention later on to the things that were truly profitable, that St. Charles attained to that wonderful facility in the composition of his sermons, which we admire when we remember the number of them and the sterling thoughts contained in them. He always prepared by writing at least an outline, a sketch, when the arduous duties of his position allowed him to do no more. But that which gave life to the well arranged thoughts of his discourses, that which inspired them with the instinct of a power leaving its impress upon the Milanese people to this day—that was the interior preparation, the laying bare of a heart free from attachments to earth, where God might mirror His own image and show it to the people who had forgotten their likeness to the heavenly original, but who might now recognize it once more in the look and tones of the preacher.

H. J. H.

CONTEMPLATED EDUCATIONAL ALLIANCE BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE.

CAN PRUDENT PARENTS IN MATTERS OF SECULAR EDUCATION PERMIT THE STATE TO CHOOSE BOOKS, TEACHERS AND COMPANIONS FOR THEIR CHILDREN?

THE question which heads this article, is one which, more than at any former period of our country's history is now forcing itself upon the public mind, and particularly upon the minds of American Catholics. For the first time in our history we have a party of Catholics in this country, who in their extreme anxiety to secure for the great mass of Catholic children the boon of a Catholic education, without subjecting their parents to the unjust burdens of a double school tax, proclaim that they are willing to accept the Public School system as it is, for all purposes of secular education (I use the word *education* in its ordinary, not in its strictly accurate sense), provided that in addition thereto the State will allow, and make it reasonably possible for their children attending the Public Schools, without cost to the State, to receive a religious education. Amongst Roman Catholics there can, of course, be no difference of opinion as to the importance and necessity of a Catholic education for Catholic children. But the great question on which Catholics are being divided is the one to which we have referred. If conscientious parents can, in the matter of secular education, safely surrender to the State the right to choose for their children school books, school teachers, school companions, and to direct and control the entire course of their secular training; and if all this can be done without any violation of the moral law, without any betrayal of the divinely appointed parental trust, and without any peril to the child's temporal and eternal happiness, then by all means let it be done, if possible, and done quickly. The consummation of such an arrangement would in that event enable every Catholic child in the country to get in the shape of secular training without detriment to morality or religion, its fair proportion of the one hundred and forty millions of dollars of public money now being annually expended for Public School purposes. But if the boon of State-governed secular education cannot be accepted without serious and deadly peril to the eternal happiness of the child, then it seems that we must either reject the tempting bait, or else prepare to stand condemned and rejected by Him who

has assured us that it will profit a man nothing "to gain the whole world and lose his own soul."

The position of those Catholics who favor this arrangement of accepting the present Public School system so far as it furnishes secular education for Catholic children, is about this: They maintain that for all purposes of secular training, the present Public School system is well nigh perfect, and that the only thing it needs to give it its finishing touch as a complete educational system, is to supplement its present secular training, with a religious education. This was the leading idea expressed by one of the distinguished lay orators—Judge Kelly, of St. Paul—in an address delivered before the Catholic Congress, held in Baltimore in 1889. Referring to the present Public School system he said:

"To say that a system builded with so much care from its humble beginning in the revolutionary period to the splendid reality of the present with the best known teaching plans; with an army of skilled and accomplished teachers, men and women; with material appointments unequaled in the world, disbursing over one hundred and fifteen millions of dollars annually, and teaching daily seven and a half million scholars, to say that such a system, defective as it is in one vital particular, should be destroyed or even crippled, is madness, and no one but a madman will advocate such a course. No! no! . . . They are the schools of the democracy—I mean it in its broad, not its party sense. In them, as in holy Church, is taught the absolute equality and brotherhood of man. Bring back to their teaching positive religion so far that the children may appreciate the fatherhood of God, and we have the perfect school, and the perfect school system, so far as human frailty will permit."

The leaders of this new educational plan, amongst whom are some distinguished Catholic divines, take the position, as I understand it, that there should be formed a sort of alliance between the Church and the State in matters of education. Not that there should be any actual union between the Church and State; but they claim, that in this great matter of education the State and the Church should move on parallel lines, the State continuing, as at present, under its existing Public School system, to impart its secular instruction to all the rising generation, both Catholic and non-Catholic, while the Catholic Church, and other churches that choose to do so, should, with the acquiescence and consent of the State, take charge of the religious education of the children of their respective denominations. It is claimed that in this way there can be no

serious conflict between the Church and the State, and that both can proceed harmoniously with the great business of education.

But can the Church and the State move upon parallel lines so long as the State insists on subjecting parents to the necessity of accepting, even for the secular education of their children, just such books, such course of study, such teachers and such school companions as it may choose, without regard to the dictates of the judgments and consciences of the parents? If the doctrines and teachings of the Catholic Church forbid Catholic parents to do that which the political State, through its school system, requires them to do, in order that they may enjoy its educational advantages, it is clear that the Church and State, in educational matters, cannot move in parallel lines. Now, does the State, through its school system, require Catholic parents, as a condition to the enjoyment of its educational advantages, to do that which the Church forbids them to do? It will not, I think, be denied by any Roman Catholic, that the teachings of the moral law as written by the finger of God on every human heart, forms a part of the teachings of the Church. Therefore, whatever the moral law forbids Catholic parents to do, the Catholic Church forbids them to do; and whatever the moral law commands them to do, the Catholic Church commands also.

Let me say that I have never made a special study of Catholic theology nor of the moral law, except so far as seemed necessary for the guidance of my own daily life, and the lives of those whom Divine Providence has placed under my charge as the head of a family.

But upon the tablet of my own heart I find plainly written these two, among other propositions, touching the natural rights and duties of parents in the matter of educating their own children, namely:

First.—All such parents as are neither mentally nor morally unfit to have the custody of children, are entitled, and in duty bound, to select for the education of their own children, schools wherein they believe that neither the teachers, the associations, nor the kind of instruction given, will seriously endanger either their health, their lives, or their morals, but will best promote their temporal and eternal welfare.

Secondly.—Neither the State nor any municipal or other government organized under its authority, should ever force upon the child of any parent—not legally adjudged mentally or morally unfit to discharge the duties of the parental office—any particular

teacher, book, or system of religious or non-religious instruction against the conscientious objections of such parent.

In the course of a long series of earnest controversies with some of my fellow-countrymen, touching the crying evils of certain anti-parental features of our Public School system, I took occasion to formulate a short educational platform, in which the above two propositions were incorporated together with five others of a kindred nature. These propositions have all received the cordial endorsement, not only of many leading Protestant ministers in this country, including Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Campbellites and other prominent Protestant churchmen, but in addition thereto they have been endorsed by more than twenty distinguished American Catholic Bishops and Archbishops, including His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, and last, but not least, they have been endorsed by the late illustrious Cardinal Manning of England. Is it not then fair to assume that these propositions correctly express the doctrine of the moral law as interpreted by the Catholic Church? In perfect harmony with the foregoing propositions is the doctrine of the moral law as laid down by Dr. Wayland in his Elements of Moral Science, where he says :

"He (the parent) is bound to inform himself of the peculiar habits and reflect upon the probable future situation of his child, and deliberately consider what sort of education will most conduce to his future happiness and usefulness. He is bound to select such instructors as will best accomplish the results which he believes will be most beneficial." (See edition published in 1856, page 316.)

Again, referring to the teacher, Wayland says :

"He must use his own best skill and judgment in governing and teaching his pupil. If he and the parent cannot agree, the connection must be dissolved." (Page 323.)

In another place Wayland says :

"Inasmuch as the moral character of the child, is greatly influenced by its associations and companions, it is the duty of the parent to watch over these with vigilance, and to control them with entire independence." (Page 329.)

Now can it be successfully denied that all these are amongst the duties which the moral law imposes upon the parents of children? And if not denied, who will undertake to harmonize this moral law which commands the parent, "to select" for his own children, "such instructors as will best accomplish the results which he believes will be most beneficial," with the Public School law which compels him

to accept for his child just such teachers as the Public School Board may choose to appoint, under the penalty of at least forfeiting all interest in the Public School funds, and either letting his child grow up in ignorance, or else impose upon himself a second school tax in order to give it such an education as his conscience dictates? Again: If the moral law makes it the duty of the parent "to watch over the associations of his child and to *control* them with entire independence" how is it possible to reconcile such a law with the Public School system whose Common Schools, in the language of Webster's definition, "are open to all." Take the the case of a prudent, watchful, careful father and mother of an innocent little child, on whose spotless soul the breath of vice has never blown; and the law of this Common School system in its very mildest form, proclaims to them in unmistakable language, "you must either forfeit the money you pay into the public treasury for educational purposes, or else you must send your child to a school where the children of the most virtuous and the children of the most vile mingle together upon terms of the utmost intimacy and fraternal equality."

In the case just instanced the Public School system is presented in its mildest shape, without the penal laws which are to secure the enforcement of attendance upon its schools. But these compulsory school laws have now become so general that they must be considered as a part of the present system. Here is a fair sample of these compulsory school laws, as it was enacted by the California Legislature in 1874, and still stands in force in this State. It requires, under heavy penalties, that "every parent or guardian * * * of any child or children between the ages of eight and fourteen * * * shall send any such child or children to a Public School for at least two-thirds of the time during which a Public School shall be taught * * * unless such child or children are excused from such attendance by the Board of Education * * * upon its being shown to their satisfaction that his or her bodily or mental condition has been such as to prevent attendance at school or application to study for the period required, or that the parents or guardians are extremely poor or sick, or that such child or children are taught in a private school or at home in such branches as are usually taught in the primary schools of the State, or have already acquired a good knowledge of such branches." It is further provided that the offending parent or guardian shall be excused if there is no Public School within one mile. This law was chiefly copied from a similar one in Massachusetts; and the United States

Commissioner of Education, in his official report for 1888–1889 (Vol. 1, p. 470), tells us that twenty-seven States and Territories of the United States have at the present time compulsory attendance laws in operation. So that compulsion is now, in fact, a general feature of the system.

If I have not misunderstood the position taken by some of those who favor this proposed educational alliance between the Church and the State—although opposed to compulsory education in the Public Schools under existing conditions—they would be inclined to favor compulsion under the proposed alliance. Let us then consider for a moment what would be the condition of the really prudent and conscientious parent with reference to the education of his children in this country should the proposed alliance become an accomplished fact, leaving the Public School system as regards secular education just as it now is. Upon the signing of the articles of alliance between the Church authorities and the State authorities, formed upon something like the Faribault plan, the bulk of Catholic Private Schools in the United States would be at once turned over into the hands of the political State, to become, as other Public Schools, Common Schools for all the purposes of secular education. In these religious schools are now gathered hundreds of thousands of Catholic and tens of thousands of non-Catholic children, whose parents were unwilling to entrust their training to the Common Schools. Much might be said touching the shock to the religious sensibilities of both teachers and pupils of these schools caused by the tearing down of holy pictures and images, and banishing from view a thousand venerated emblems of their faith, certainly not less sacred in the eyes of every true Catholic than is the statue of Washington in the eyes of every American patriot. And did any friend of this proposed alliance ever stop to ask himself the question, what will our blessed Saviour say when He sees one of the priests of His holy altar taking down and banishing from the school-house the crucifix, in order to make place for the statue of even so great a patriot as George Washington? And will He look on with an approving smile while the same priest orders the statue of His blessed Mother to be taken from its pedestal and nailed up in a rude box out of sight, in order to make room for the bust of Abraham Lincoln?

But there are other, and in some respects more important, features of the contemplated alliance and its probable results, which demand our most serious consideration. In the first place how would it af-

fect our Catholic teaching communities themselves? To answer this inquiry, let us imagine a practical case in our own city of San Diego. We have here a very excellent Catholic Convent School, owned and conducted by the good Sisters of St. Joseph, whose mother house is in the city of St. Louis, Missouri. Now let us suppose that the contemplated alliance being accomplished, the Catholic Priest of this parish, under instructions from his Bishop, should by command or persuasion induce the good Sisters to sell or lease their Convent to the Public School Board of this city for Common School purposes: just as the Faribault School Board leased from the Sisters their school in the city of Faribault. What would be the first step taken by the Board in the way of appointing teachers for this new Public School? As an act of seeming fairness and liberality, it is more than probable that in the first instance a tender would be made to the Sisters, of positions as teachers in the school; and if they could endure the humiliation of transferring their obedience as teachers of a Catholic School, from their religious superiors, to a board of politicians, they would perhaps be installed as the first secular teachers under the new order of things. But how long would they be permitted to retain these positions? If, under the Public School system, genuine merit were a sure guarantee for such position, then, no doubt, the permanency of their employment would be assured. But is genuine merit as a rule the only or the chief passport to preferment under the Public School system? Those who have had the official management of this system, and who have had most to do with its methods, are doubtless best able to answer this question; therefore let us hear what some of them say on the subject. Miss Gail Hamilton in her book entitled "Our Public School System," at pages 219 and 220, quotes from the official report of the Ohio Commissioner of Education the statement that "*of the 23,000 public school teachers in Ohio, at least 10,000 are as utterly unfit to teach school as to practice law.*" And on page 224 she quotes from the same officer the statement, that

"Nowhere else in the public service except alone among the public school officers can there be found such a large percentage of incompetence, indifference, inefficiency and native incapacity to do the work engaged in, as can be found in the army of persons employed to teach the public schools."

And yet at the centennial celebration in Philadelphia, Ohio carried off the palm for her superior Public School exhibit. Wherefore the inquiry arises; if Ohio with 10,000 utterly incompetent

teachers obtained the best Public School results, how much larger a share of incompetent teachers proportionally must the other States have had? But the question may be asked, how is it that such a large proportion of incompetent teachers secure positions in the Public Schools in preference to so many who are much better fitted for the positions, and who would gladly accept employment? An official report of Superintendent Taylor of the San Francisco Public Schools, made in November, 1881, very clearly solves this problem. In the course of that report Mr. Taylor says:

"If the time ever comes when Boards of Education and School Trustees will appoint the teachers who are best qualified in learning, ability and experience, and not from friendship, political or religious preferences, then will the scholars prosper best, and children be more thoroughly 'educated.' . . . In this city the teacher, irrespective of qualifications and experience, provided she or he hold a certificate, who can bring the most pressure to bear on the Board of Education, is almost sure of an appointment." Further on he adds:

"And it is a well known fact that the most incompetent teachers bring the most outside pressure to bear on the Board."

Under the political workings and wire-working of such a system, how would it be possible for these good Sisters to retain their positions, even if they were disposed to do so? It seems impossible to doubt that under the conditions suggested, the members of almost every religious teaching community in the United States, both male and female, would be driven from their employment and compelled to either abandon their communities or to seek in another land an opportunity to fulfill the work of their order. And then what would become of that boasted religious education we were to get for our Catholic children in consideration of having surrendered both them and our schools into the hands of the political State?

Hitherto the chief nurseries, the main supports, the strong and sure protection of Catholicity in this country, have been our excellent Catholic Educational Institutions. Destroy them, in the manner proposed, and what becomes of the future of Catholicity in America? Who shall then light and keep burning the torch of faith in the minds and hearts of our Catholic youth, when these chief barriers are broken down and destroyed which now guard and protect them alike from the assaults of their own passions; and from the fury of the gathering storm of infidelity, atheism, socialism, and anarchy that rages without?

But even if our religious teaching communities could and would retain their places in the schools they have established—supposing their transfer to the political State—still, having no authority from, or privity with the parents of their pupils, so far as their secular training is concerned, how could they sufficiently guard the morals of their Catholic pupils against the contaminating touch of vile associations? To quote again Webster's definition of a common school, he says: "It is a school maintained at the public expense, and *open to all.*"

Now a school that is open to all, is not only open to the children of good and virtuous parents, who would rather die than set them a bad example, or permit them to associate with the crime-steeped progeny of the low and vile; but such a school is open also to the prematurely vicious and depraved, who have been born and bred, perchance, amidst the low sinks of iniquity; children whose infant eyes have already grown familiar with obscene signs, lewd pictures and lecherous behavior; children to whose ears vile oaths, blasphemous language and words revolting to modesty are as ordinary habits of speech.

Doctor J. H. Kellog, whose long experience as a physician enabled him to speak by the record touching the effects of evil associations, in an elaborate medical treatise published a few years ago, says:

"A bad boy can do more harm in a community than can be counteracted by all the clergymen, Sabbath-school teachers and other Christian workers combined. We have known instances in which a boy of seven or eight years of age had planted the venom of vice in the hearts and minds of half a score of pure-minded lads, within a few days of his first association with them." And he adds:

"A boy with a match box in a powder magazine would be in no greater danger than in the company of most of the lads who attend our *Public Schools* and play upon the streets."

One of the most difficult tasks which those charged with the conducting of religious schools have to perform, is the keeping out of their institutions pupils already steeped in vice. And in spite of all that their best directed efforts can do, still they cannot wholly exclude, even from the best guarded private colleges and convents, the blighting curse of bad companionship. But what gigantic proportions would this evil assume in the same colleges and convents, were all of them converted into Common Schools, thereby forcing

the innocent and pure into the most intimate companionship with the low and the vile!

In a long continued struggle between the Church authorities and the State authorities, for the educational control of the Catholic youth of this country, the State authorities, either accidentally or designedly, have evidently pursued the wiser course—I mean the course much better calculated to achieve success. In almost every locality where there were Catholic children, they have placed Catholic teachers in the Public Schools. This has given to Catholic parents, and, we may say also, sometimes to Catholic priests, a false and misplaced confidence in them. It must not be forgotten that a Catholic teacher, under State control, ceases to be a Catholic teacher. It must not be forgotten, too, that one of the greatest dangers to morals in a Public School, comes from bad companionship, against which the teacher, under the Public School system, is utterly powerless to guard his pupils. Furthermore, knowing the popular prejudice against their religion, and fearing to lose their positions, such Catholic teachers in Public Schools have sometimes been known to cowardly acquiesce in the foulest aspersions cast upon their own faith. And there have been cases where such so-called Catholic teachers actively used their influence to have Catholic children withdrawn from Catholic schools and sent to the Public Schools, with which they were connected. Whoever will take the pains to learn the truth, will find that throughout the United States the great army of Catholic teachers in the Public Schools—with, indeed, some honorable exceptions—are the staunchest defenders of the Common School system, and the most deadly opponents of their co-religionists, whether priests or laymen, who dare to expose its demoralizing and soul-destroying influences. Next to these interested parties, who lavish their extravagant and fulsome praises upon this system, comes a numerous class of Catholic politicians, who fancy, apparently, that the only way to counteract the popular prejudice against their creed is to out-Herod Herod in praising "our glorious Public School system."

But there should be no end, were I to attempt to crowd into this article a history of all the disastrous results to Catholic morality and religion of which during the last fifty years, sad to say, Catholics themselves have been among the chief authors, by their vain attempts to reconcile Catholicity with an educational institution, which was begotten, born and bred, consciously or unconsciously, in direct antagonism to the moral law, which, as before said, is an essential

part of Catholicity itself. Let us no longer attempt the impossible task of reconciling God and His everlasting enemy. The thing cannot be done.

Yet the question may here be asked: Ought not something to be done to rescue the millions of American Catholic children who are in daily attendance on our Public Schools? Most assuredly something ought to be done and done quickly for these Catholic children; and something ought also to be done for the millions of non-Catholic children who are fast running to ruin on the same downward road. In fact, something ought to have been done a long time ago. But better late than never. What then is the first thing to be done? The first thing, it seems to me, is for each one concerned, and especially for those who lead in the matter of education to examine this Public School question deliberately, and judge it by the light of facts, and neither by the silly fulminations of demagogues nor by the misrepresentations of interested partisans. And when we have satisfied ourselves as to what there is clearly wrong in the system, we should go to work harmoniously and unitedly; point out that wrong to our fellow-citizens, and ask in a legitimate, manly and proper way to have the wrong remedied; and in good time it will be done. Should we come to the conclusion that the wrong features of this system injure nobody but Catholics, we might expect to have a long and difficult road to travel, before reaching a remedy. But if on the other hand we conclude that the evils of the system are wide-spread and general, embittering the homes and poisoning the happiness of people of every creed, calling and condition; and if this general evil is so palpable, that, in order to see and know the fact it is only necessary that attention be called thereto; in that event, we may expect that the speed with which our work progresses, will largely depend on the earnestness, the zeal, and the harmony of the efforts with which we appeal to our fellow-countrymen. Now, nobody—and particularly no parent, who stops for one moment to consult the dictates of his own heart, can fail to see that the taking of the educational control of the child away from the father and mother, who love it as nobody else can; who know its weak and strong points of body and mind and heart as no others can; whose own happiness or misery depends almost as much on the child's good or bad training as does the happiness or misery of the child itself—there is none, I say, who can fail to see that the transferring of the educational control to strangers, is clearly and palpably unnatural and wrong. But as

a salve for this grievous wrong, the great mass of the American people have long since persuaded themselves into the belief, that this Public School system was a preventative of crime. And building on this utterly false assumption of fact they answer every objection against the system by saying: "Well the system is at least the best preventative of crime and it is surely better to build public school houses and pay teachers salaries, than to build jails and penitentiaries and keep up a standing army of policemen." This argument generally closes the discussion, unless the person to whom it is addressed, is in a condition by an exact and well authenticated quotation of educational and criminal statistics, to prove that without a solitary exception, in the Public School States there has been far more crime than in the non-Public School States; and that, taking the same Public School State, at different periods of its own history, an examination of its statistics shows that its growth in crime has borne a direct proportion to the growth of its public school expenditures. The convincing force of this fact when brought home to the thinking mind, is more effective in making converts to the cause of parental rights in educational matters, than a whole volume of well-reasoned theory. It was this statistical fact which Richard Grant White, in his celebrated article, entitled the "Public School Failure," characterized as "*Evidence which proves the case against the public school system as clearly and as undeniably as Newton's theory of gravitation is proved by the calculations which enable Astronomers to declare the motions and weigh the substance of the planets.*"

It was the force of this fact, that a few years ago at a public discussion of the School question in the city of Oakland, California—with the State Superintendent of Public Instructions presiding—caused a large audience, by a standing and almost unanimous vote, to sustain the doctrine of parental rights in educational matters, and that subsequently brought into harmony on that subject, nearly every Catholic and Protestant clergyman in the cities of Oakland and San Francisco.

If the Catholics of these United States, bishops, priests and laymen, in conjunction with all the non-Catholics who might join them, would plant themselves squarely and immovably on the doctrine of parental rights in educational matters, precisely as laid down by Doctor Wayland—who was not a Catholic, either native or foreign born, but a distinguished American Protestant minister—and if by every available means in their reach, they would bring

home to the American people a knowledge of the startling facts which demonstrate the terrible results to the child, the family and the State, arising from a violation of these sacred rights; just as surely as the rising sun dispels the darkness of night, just so surely would a general knowledge of these results bring relief from the cruel and oppressive evils of our Public School system.

But again the question comes up, what is in the meantime to be done with our vast army of Catholic children now running to ruin in our Public Schools? We answer: The evil is too vast in its proportions to be remedied all at once. But if our Catholic parents all over this country are made to realize the peril in which their children are placed by the lack of a proper religious education coupled with their subjection to all the evil influences of a Public School training; and at the same time are made to feel the heavy weight of their own parental responsibility before God and society, for the proper bringing up of their own children; and also, how intimately their own honor, as well as their own temporal and eternal happiness, is connected with their children's proper education; and if they are further made to understand that while it is the business of the Church to enlighten their consciences touching the educational duties they owe their children, it is not the business of the Church, but it is their own business, to the full extent of their ability, to furnish the necessary money to pay for that education, very much shall have been accomplished. When parents have done all they can, then of course the hand of charity should be invoked to come to their assistance, and to supplement their efforts. As regards those poor parents—the scanty wages of whose daily toil are insufficient to meet the educational necessities of their children—let the aid of wealthy Catholics be invoked in their behalf. It seems to me that the Catholic millionaire who can be made to see and appreciate the present dire necessities for a religious education, under which multitudes of poor Catholic children are laboring; and who would permit these poor children to lie perishing with the festering sores of ignorance and vice for the want of assistance that he could easily afford, will find a hotter climate in the other world than Dives did. Finally, should every other resource fail, to quote the sentiment of one of our most zealous priests in the cause of Catholic education: "Far better convert every Catholic Church into a school-house, and melt into coin the golden crucifixes and sacred vessels, for an educational fund, rather than suffer multitudes of Catholic children to stray from the faith, into the paths of infidelity and vice." If we,

the Catholics of this country, bishops, priests, parents and teachers, will make no unholy alliances; will keep within the bounds of God's holy law, and do our whole duty to meet the existing crisis, who can doubt that God will bless our efforts, and eventually crown them with success!

ZACH. MONTGOMERY.

CLERICAL STUDIES.

TENTH ARTICLE.

APOLOGETICS II.

AN important task lies to-day before every official representative of the Christian faith, the task of vindicating its absolute truth; of dispelling the clouds which are ever gathering around it; of strengthening the convictions of those who believe, and of giving rest to the minds of the unsettled and perplexed.

The duty, it is true, is very unequally divided; but we can hardly imagine any position in which a priest is entirely exempt from it, and the ability to perform it may be looked upon, in most cases, as a fair standard, for each one, of his own usefulness. This, indeed, is so generally felt in recent years that it has led to giving a large and ever-increasing share to the study of apologetics in all the programmes of clerical studies. No priest now goes forth to the work of the ministry without having made himself acquainted with the principal objections directed against Christianity at large and against its essential doctrines.

But this is only a beginning. For many of the difficulties expounded in the class-room are only imperfectly realized by the young student. It is later on that they will assume their full force, when a deeper view of things, or a closer contact with perplexed minds will compel him to look more deliberately into them and deal with them more thoroughly than he could have done whilst still a stranger to hesitation or misgiving.

Besides, as has been already remarked, the lines of attack and defence are constantly changing. Objections much spoken of in the last century, or even in the last generation, are now almost forgotten, whilst others have come up and taken possession of men's minds. To see this for himself, the reader has only to open any of

the apologetic works written thirty or forty years ago. Side by side with many things of permanent value, as true and as useful now as when written, how much will he find unsatisfactory; how much missing of what would be needed to meet the difficulties of the day? Even our text books, though occasionally revised, are seldom quite up to date, so that it only remains for the defender of the faith, if he would be truly helpful to his fellow-men, to labor unceasingly for himself and to keep pace with the onward course of contemporary thought in its bearing on the truth of religion.

This, of course, has to be done in a manner and a measure in keeping with the requirements, the surroundings and the facilities of each individual priest. But we may be permitted here to state the general lines on which all should proceed and the higher principles which they should steadily keep in view.

The objections or difficulties with which the apologist is concerned arise, and can arise only, from the opposition existing, or supposed to exist, between Revealed Religion on the one side and Human Knowledge on the other.

Three things therefore have, in each case, to be considered: (*a*) the statements of science or human knowledge; (*b*) the teachings of the Christian faith; (*c*) the true nature of their relations, that is, how far they agree or disagree. It is only when these three things are ascertained that the difficulty can be properly dealt with, and each one of them suggests important remarks.

I.

First of all, then, the apologist has to consider the facts and principles, philosophical, historical, scientific, etc., which give rise to the difficulty under consideration, and ascertain their true value, that is, how far what is objected belongs to demonstrated truth, or is only a plausible induction, an ingenious theory, or a mere conjecture.

For it may be any one of these, though ushered in under the magic name of science. Only the most ignorant believe that whatever is styled scientific is unquestionably true. As a fact, in every science, mathematics excepted, in conjunction with ascertained truths, we find an indefinite number of positions, statements, deductions, etc., which are anything but certain. Philosophy, for instance, is a science; but who thinks of considering everything in philosophy as beyond doubt? History is a science; yet how little comparatively we are absolutely sure of in history! Political

economy is a science; still the ablest men are divided on some of its fundamental problems. Medicine is a science, or rather a group of sciences; yet how much in it remains conjectural! Even in the field of physical science, where endless observations and experiments have given to a certain number of facts and laws an authority never again to be questioned, how many others await a more thorough verification, whilst high above them all, the general theories which so powerfully captivate the popular mind are only plausible guesses. We talk flippantly of ether, electricity, forces, physical and chemical, attraction, gravitation, molecules and atoms, as if we had them all spread out before our eyes, yet what are they all but guesses—likely enough because they account for the facts, but liable to disappear any day in presence of some broader synthesis, or simpler explanation, or of new facts which they are insufficient to account for?

Such then is human knowledge in all its departments and at each one of its successive stages: a collection, in varying proportions, of certainties, probabilities, conjectures and hypotheses.

To which of these categories do the statements made into objections belong? This is the first question which the apologist has to investigate. He may be competent to do so of himself, by virtue of a previous special training, or because the case is of that kind which requires only ordinary care and common sense. For it would be a mistake to imagine that the man of average understanding and culture is not just as capable of observing certain facts as a specialist, or of drawing his conclusions from them, if properly ascertained. Indeed, as a rule, there is no necessity for a personal independent judgment, the point in question having been ordinarily tested already by men of undoubted competence. When they are all agreed, the uninitiated may safely accept their award: in fact it would be presumptuous to depart from it. Thus, in history, in philosophy, in the various sciences, there are conclusions bearing directly or indirectly on religion, so commonly received on all sides that a defender of the faith would only injure himself and his cause by opposing them.

But if the representatives of the science to which the question belongs are divided among themselves; if great names and great schools are found on opposite sides, surely the apologist has a right to consider that question as unsettled and to deal with it accordingly.

Such is the case at the present day with the famous theories of Transformism and Evolution. The principal facts upon which they

rest are not questioned, and the theories themselves have undoubtedly won the favor of many distinguished men of science. But then they have met with opposition at the hands of others not less distinguished, and, as a consequence, to the uninitiated, that is to the immense majority even of cultivated men, they can appeal only as a plausible yet questionable hypothesis.

The same remark applies to the conclusions which have been proposed in connection with Biblical subjects. Only a few have won universal acquiescence. The others remain a subject of lively discussion between those whose special knowledge entitles them to an independent judgment. The apologist in his professional capacity, is equally free to discuss or to dismiss them. If he sees his way to prove the weakness of what is objected, he may do so ; if not, he can wait until the specialists have settled their differences.

II.

What has been said of secular, holds good also of religious knowledge. As it is found in books and in the minds of most believers, it is a compound, not only of defined dogmas and of commonly accepted doctrines, but also of probable deductions, of opinions and conjectures which each one is free to adopt or to dismiss as his judgment may dictate. Children generally look upon all that has been told them in their religious instruction as part of the Christian Doctrine. They grow up in that belief, and thousands live and die holding on to religious notions which rest on the slenderest foundations, simply because these notions had originally come to them from the same source as the rest, and had been delivered to them as an explanation or a development of some essential doctrine.

Of course the more enlightened know that there is a difference between doctrines strictly enjoined and mere opinions. They know that in the course of ages there has gathered round the solid centre of divine truth a series of speculations, interpretations, conclusions of very unequal value, but they cannot go far in the application of the principle. Even theologians often disagree in such matters, some holding doctrines as obligatory which others consider as matters of opinion. Their agreement itself does not always suffice to settle questions, for they may concur in probabilities as well as in certainties.

To give a few examples. How much, for instance, we hear and read of the angels and of the evil spirits, and yet of how little of what regards them we are absolutely sure! Again, theologians and

mystical writers give us long chapters on the state of innocence in which man was originally established; but a little attention will suffice to show that most of what is said on the subject is only probable or merely conjectural. And so it is with many other familiar tenets, such as those commonly connected with the dogmas of Purgatory, Indulgences, Heaven, Hell, and the like. All through, we find the same disproportion between what is commonly said and what is positively certain.

But nowhere is it more striking than in the notions which for centuries were gathered from the Bible. For, whilst admitting readily that many expressions in the sacred writings should not be taken literally, yet instinctive reverence for the word of God led Christian minds to accept in their obvious sense all the statements they found in it, so long as they had no positive cogent reason to depart from such an interpretation. In this way, for example, they were led to believe that the whole visible world was created in the space of six ordinary days, about six thousand years ago; that the earth was the principal part of the divine work, and that the sun, moon and stars were created in view of it; that Noah enclosed in the ark specimens of all living creatures incapable of sustaining life in the waters of the deluge; that the deluge itself extended over the whole surface of the earth; that the various tongues spoken since the flood were all miraculously originated at the Tower of Babel, etc., etc.

If we take up any of the older exponents of the Bible, or of theology, Catholic and Protestant, this is what we find unhesitatingly stated in them, not indeed as part of the Catholic faith, but as the obvious meaning of the sacred narrative from which they did not feel at liberty to depart because they saw no sufficient reason to do so. But the reasons came. Modern science proved the old positions to be untenable, and gradually the Catholic mind withdrew from them, or continued to state them only in a loose and hesitating way.

Nor should we look upon this evolution of Christian doctrine, even in the Catholic Church, as having reached its term. Outside the region of dogma, many facts and views commonly admitted at the present day may have to be given up at some later period, whilst others freely debated in our time may, centuries hence, assume the substantial form of ascertained and unquestioned Christian doctrines.

Meanwhile the apologist has to determine to the best of his power, and with all the helps at his command, what is final in

Christian belief and what approximates to it; what is sufficiently proven to be a practical, though not an infallible rule of thought; what may be freely held or rejected; what can no longer be reasonably sustained. Much of this work of doctrinal classification he will find already done. But it is never ended. Especially in a period of transition like ours, new views come up every day and have to be tested. What seemed to be finally settled has often to be considered afresh, and the whole situation to be occasionally reviewed with care.

III.

The respective positions of religious and secular knowledge once thoroughly ascertained, either in general or in any given case, it only remains to place them in presence of each other and compare their respective statements.

Now the Vatican Council tells us that between the certainties of faith and those of reason, that is, of human knowledge, there can be no real contradiction. Therefore whatever opposition there may seem to be, either is only apparent or, if real, it occurs in the outer region which does not belong to true science or to true faith.

As a fact, the principal objections of unbelievers are based on misapprehension. They are directed against a distorted view of Christian doctrines, or against opinions which form no essential part of them. Of this we have a striking instance in the old-fashioned and shallow, yet ever effective attacks of Mr. Ingersoll, who almost invariably assails, not so much the essential doctrines of the Christian faith as the human conceptions of them which are often much more open to attack. Indeed misrepresentation and calumny, conscious or unconscious, have been at all times the favorite weapons of infidels. To repel them, only one thing is needed: a plain statement of the truth, such, for instance, as Archbishop Ryan's remarkable lecture: "What Catholics do not believe." The truth once known, the objection is meaningless and falls to the ground.

But if the opposition be real, as may happen, when the statements put forth in the name of science, or religion, or of both, have no claim to certainty, even in the eyes of their most accredited representatives, how is it to be dealt with?

In the same way as in any other subject. The stronger side should prevail; and if neither side can claim the victory, the question at issue should remain open and undecided.

As we have just suggested, three cases are conceivable; scientific

certainties in opposition with theological opinions; ascertained religious doctrines in opposition with scientific speculations; conflicting conclusions and views of religion and science, none of which can claim to be demonstrably certain.

Now, first of all, as often as the progress of human knowledge, be it history, biblical criticism, or natural science, leads, by sudden discoveries or by a slow, steady accumulation of facts or inductions, to conclusions morally, if not absolutely certain, it becomes the duty of the defender of the opposite positions held under the name of religion gracefully to yield. The cause of religion can gain nothing, and is sure to lose much, by an obstinate defence of what has become untenable. It is not, nor has it ever been, the policy of the Catholic Church to close her eyes to evidence and cling indiscriminately to all that is old. How many long accredited notions have not her exponents given up within the present century in Church history, for instance, and in biblical exegesis! How much of what the Fathers and ancient commentators have gathered round the first chapters of Genesis has slowly given way under the ever increasing pressure of modern discovery! Individuals may have suffered in the process, but Religion, far from losing, has emerged from it more youthful and more free.

But when certainty is on the other side; when the statement put forth in the name of religion is an indubitable element of the Christian faith, it becomes the duty of the apologist to insist that the opposite views and speculations of human knowledge, however plausible, shall give way. Thus, for instance, the unity of the human species, now commonly admitted as part of the general theory of evolution, was much questioned forty years ago by scientists, because, in the hypothesis of a common origin, they were unable to account for the difference of race found among the inhabitants of the globe. If no other but human knowledge could be appealed to, they might have maintained, as some still do, that distinct races of men must have been created from the beginning. But the opposite is not only a natural, but a religious fact, clearly implied in the sacred narrative. It is at the very root of the whole Christian economy of the Fall and of the Redemption; and so it only remains for the apologist to maintain it unhesitatingly, and for the scientists to whom we refer, if they be Christians, to relinquish their speculations, and add one more to the many facts of Nature they are unable to account for.

Finally, there are cases of conflict in which no certainties are

found on either side; no doctrines to which religion is definitely committed, no scientific theory, no historical fact which can be looked upon as proven—current opinions, beliefs, probabilities on both sides. As might be expected, the choice will be guided for each one by his predominant mental habits and tendencies. The scientist, the critic, the scholar, will be naturally disposed to make light of the religious opinions which interfere with their favorite views. The theologian, on the contrary, instinctively conservative, will find it much easier to thrust aside a scientific theory, though attractive and plausible, than to part with views of which he had never thought but with reverence, and which are often inseparably bound up with the earliest and holiest impressions of his life.

But justice and expediency equally forbid the apologist to follow uniformly one or the other course. *Ex hypothesi*, the truth may be at either side; he has therefore to lean in each case to where it is most likely to be found. The conservative disposition of theologians is undoubtedly praiseworthy; but to be guided by it, regardless of all besides, would be far more injurious than serviceable to the cause of religion.

1. First of all, it would justify in some measure the reproach so often addressed to its followers, of clinging blindly to the past in all things, and of discountenancing and impeding all progress capable of disturbing their quietude.

2. Next it would inevitably lead to humiliation. For although many seeming advances of human knowledge ultimately come to nothing, there are many others which, from weak beginnings, advance steadily, and ultimately win universal favor. To oppose these persistently in the name of religion is simply to commit ourselves to a losing battle and expose us to be driven back from one position to another, and finally be compelled to surrender at discretion, simply because we have undertaken to defend our religion with weak weapons.

In the last century any questioning of the literal sense of the first chapter of Genesis was resented as irreligious. Dom Calmet refers indignantly to those who were disposed to admit more than an interval of twenty-four hours between the great creative act and the production of light. But afterwards, in presence of the conclusions of geology, commentators were only too happy to allow countless ages for the first and for each one of the following days of creation. Even thus widened indefinitely, the sacred narrative still accommodates itself imperfectly to ascertained facts, and some of the ablest

defenders of Revelation in our time are led to see in it allegory, poetry, liturgy, anything but a historical narrative of facts.

In the same way a time was when the chronology of the Vulgate, based on the Hebrew text, reigned supreme. But its narrower limits proving insufficent to accommodate all the facts newly discovered, interpreters fell back on the broader lines of the Septuagint. These have in turn proved unequal to the requirements of the case, and so our apologists are driven to maintain that there is no such thing at all as a consecutive chronology in the Bible. Besides the humiliation of thus ever yielding, there is in it something especially dangerous for the faith of the observant and thoughtful. For, as they watch the retreating movements and the narrowing lines of those who have assumed to explain and defend the Christian religion, a fear naturally arises in their minds that, one after the other, all the positions held by believers may be ultimately captured by the advancing armies of scientific infidelity. It is, in fact, what they actually see in every one of the sects outside the Catholic Church—doctrines and facts of paramount importance, if historical Christianity is to remain, feebly defended, or entirely surrendered to save what is considered more vital still. Whence a spectacle so disheartening even within the lines of Catholic orthodoxy? Simply because these lines have been unduly extended, and mere human conceptions are unwisely defended in the name of the Christian faith.

3. Finally, Catholic scientists may fairly claim, on their side, that if a suspicion of unsoundness in the faith is kept constantly hovering over such of their views as seem to run counter to commonly received theological opinions, their Christian conscience is unjustly alarmed and saddened, whilst their liberty of research and speculation is unduly limited. It will not suffice to say: "Prove your case and you will no longer be interfered with." It was exactly what Bellarmine said to Galileo. But just then Galileo could not supply demonstrative proof. It often takes generations to demonstrate what the genius of one man has intuitively divined. The theories which, in the course of time, have won universal assent, began by being humble hypotheses which could only claim to be admitted on trial, until the facts, patiently observed, would reveal their real value.

IV.

These reflections might seem to suggest an entirely opposite course, namely, that of narrowing at once the line of defence by

giving up all the disputed points which form no part of the faith, and concentrating the available forces on what belongs essentially to the Christian Revelation.

But such a method cannot stand the test of a close examination.

First of all, it would require a previous agreement as to what doctrines are essential to make up the complete body of Revelation, and such an agreement, as all theologians know, is simply impossible. Even if the line were to be drawn sharply at what is *de fide Catholica*, it would give rise to endless discussions. (Note the recent controversies on inspiration, evolution, etc.)

But it could not be drawn so close, for all theologians agree that, outside what has been formally defined, there is a large number of doctrinal statements which a Catholic is not free to deny without laying himself open to the imputation of heterodoxy.

Next, even among those religious beliefs which, in our present condition of knowledge, cannot be looked upon as certain, there are many which recommend themselves in various ways to the reverence of the enlightened Christian, which he will instinctively retain as long as he can do so reasonably and consistently, and relinquish with reluctance if ever the force of argument compels him to do so. Meanwhile it may, and often will, be found that the traditional position was stronger than had been imagined, that the point in question was more closely bound up than was thought in the body of the faith, and that by a timely resistance one more element of divine truth had been rescued from desecration and fully brought to light in the Church of God.

We are thus led back to our original position, that of recommending to the apologist equal justice toward all that comes up before him whether it proceed from a religious or a secular source. In the region of opinion mistakes are always possible, and it is the duty of the apologist to detect, not to defend them. He is the armed champion, not of old traditions, nor of new theories, but of ascertained religious truth. It is none of his business, as an apologist, to take sides in questions freely debated. To the Catholic Church alone it belongs to put an end to all controversies in which Religion has a share, and she is remarkably slow to do so. Patient and serene in the midst of excitement and clamor, she quietly bides her time, and when she does interfere, it is much oftener in a disciplinary and directive, than in a doctrinal way.

The apologist can do no better than imitate her. Ever strenuous in the defence of necessary truth, he should learn, in what is still

undecided, to stand back, and watch, and wait. He is not the only defender of the Christian faith. Inside and outside the Church it reckons other earnest and devoted supporters. Their action will serve to guide his efforts, whilst the vicissitudes of the contest will show him better than aught else what may be sustained, what should be abandoned, what needs further elucidation before anything definite can be reached. In this way his powers will be devoted only to the maintenance of divine truth and Religion will be committed to nothing beyond itself.

J. HOGAN.

WHY BRING THE FLOCKS TO NAZARETH?

IT is a somewhat narrow and steep mountain path which, forming part of the old commercial route between Ptolemais and Capharnaum, leads to the pretty village of Nazra, once the priestly though despised city of Nazareth. The site is extremely picturesque, and the bright clusters of flat-roofed houses looking from their height, twelve hundred feet above the sea, upon the rich green slopes studded with bloom, which lie between the broken hills around, have justly given it the Hebrew name of "Flower" or "City of Flowers."

If, despite the beauty of its surroundings and its Levitic association, Nazareth was in bad repute among the Jews at the time of our Lord, it may be due to the fact that for a long time past it had been a favorite halting place for caravans on the Roman road from Syria where they exchanged guides with those returning from the South and West, thus bringing into the city Romans, Phoenicians, Syrians and Arabs, all of whom—not to mention the hateful Samaritans—were supposed to contaminate the Jews who held frequent intercourse with them.

But far more remarkable, even at this day, than the charm of its position, is the character of the inhabitants. The Syrian Christians of Nasra, almost entirely of Jewish descent, differ strangely from the people around them, and the distinctive features of physical beauty and of a marked modesty of manner among the women and children has been a subject of comment by travelers for centuries back. Non-Catholic writers have found an explanation of the fact in the location of the town amid beautiful scenery, pervaded by the

pure mountain atmosphere, and its comparative seclusion, where if strangers frequently sojourned, the habits of city life could not be easily introduced—elements which are supposed to be altogether favorable to the cultivation of the domestic virtues as well as to the development of physical beauty. Whatever be the true reason, the fact, as Mr. Geikie remarks, of "Its bright-eyed, happy children and comely women strike the traveler, and even their dress differs from that of other parts."[1] Fretté in his beautiful Life of Christ, only recently published, mentions what is stated already by Barbier in his "Letters of a Pilgrim," how the women of Nazarath speak in reverent tones of their relationship to the Blessed Mother of Christ, and how in every feature they strive to imitate the Immaculate Virgin, each of them, according to a custom observed from time immemorial, carrying upon their bosoms, in little embroidered pockets, a copy of the first chapter of St. John's Gospel in which the beloved Disciple declares the "Word become Incarnate."[2] The women of the town dress ordinarily in a long, blue garment, wearing a purple head-gear over which a white cotton veil hangs down to the waist, serving to cover the mouth, as is the habit of women in the East. They are, as has been said, exceedingly fair and graceful, yet their modest attire, so like to that which we associate with the image of her

> "Whose virgin bosom was uncrossed
> With the least shade or thought of sin allied,"

is in singular contrast with the ostentatious fashion of the Eastern women and particularly of those on the plain of Esdraelon in the immediate neighborhood of Nazra whose "wonderful taste in the combination of the brightest colors draws the attention."[3]

If you ask the mothers of Nazareth what makes their children so beautiful, and whence they have their pretty domestic habits, they will point to the grotto close by where once stood the home of Mary the mother of Jesus.

It is to this same home, the home of Jesus, Mary and Joseph, that Leo XIII, the head of Pastors, bids the shepherds of our day, far and near, lead their flocks. From the first he had pointed out

1 Life of Christ, ch. xii, by Cunningham Geikie.

2 "En effet, aujourd'hui encore, toutes les femmes de cette ville se croient et se disent cousines de Marie, mère de Jésus, et s'efforcent d'imiter les vertus de la Vierge Immaculée. Elles ont, de temps immémorial, l'habitude d'avoir sur leur poitrine le premier chapitre de l'Evangile selon saint Jean, enfermé dans un petit sachet brodé.—*Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ, sa vie et ses enseignements.* Par M. l'abbé S. E. Fretté, Vol. I., p. 139.

3 Geikie, l. c.

how the present social problems can be solved only by a speedy return to Christian principles of action; next he showed how this return is completely possible only by maintaining the education of the young upon soundly and exclusively Catholic lines. But modern civilization with its system of neutral schools, has made this also more difficult than in the past. The glitter of secular education and the free offer of its advantages has rendered Catholic parents in some cases blind to the danger of placing their children under the influence of this onesided advancement. In places where the ecclesiastical superiors had from some cause or other failed to attend to the vital duty of forewarning and forearming their people, parents became callous in proportion as on the one hand the demands for sacrifice confronted them unexpectedly, whilst on the other the facilities offered by the State were rapidly enlarged. When Catholic parents cease to demand Catholic schools for their children, it is no longer possible for the Church to educate the latter. She must turn her attention to first *educating the parents*.

Hence the reform in such circumstances must begin with the family. This is the meaning, no doubt, of the Sovereign Pontiff's appeal to the Bishops that they arouse their clergy to active interest in the promotion of a holy family life, a life patterned upon that of the Home of Nazareth. For although such work has always been part of the pastoral care, yet it was never more needed than to-day, when communistic principles are threatening to destroy systematically the ties and obligations of family life. Earnest men everywhere recognize the necessity of concentrating our efforts in the reform of society upon the purifying elements of home life. "Were I a statesman," says Mr. Fernald in his admirable book on The New Womanhood, "and could I know that our sixty millions of people were all gathered in twelve million pure and happy homes I should not tremble for my country, whatever party might hold the reins of power. Such a nation could survive mistake, migovernment or even revolution. Were I a general on some perilous day, needing that my army should do and dare all that men can do and dare, I should hope all things of a host that saw loved hearth-stones through the smoke of their camp-fires. Did I rule the wide world, and could I secure that each of its myriad toilers and teachers should go forth in the morning from a perfect home, and return at night to that sweet shelter, I should have hope that, not far in the future, waited the glad millennial day . . . Individualizing the home . . . would be the best defence against Communism, which knows no

home, and Anarchy which destroys it. Let 'my home' be the fixed star of first magnitude in every man's sky, and he will not be swift to contemplate social upheaval, nor tolerant of schemes to destroy social order."

If hitherto we have watched the families of our flocks, striving to draw them to the church by the attractiveness of the service, by instructions, by missions and by periodical visitations of their homes, a new way of eliciting their attention to the one thing of paramount importance is presented in the spectacle of Nazareth which we bring henceforth into the individual home. If many can not or will not come to the church, let us bring the church, so to speak, into their houses ; let us transform each home into a chapel, and there place the sign which will be to them a sermon of constant warning, of perpetual encouragement, and a touching invitation daily repeated to follow in the steps of Jesus, Mary and Joseph. The image of the Holy Family, will be to our Christian homes what the *Mesusah* was of old to the people of Israel. There at the door of every Hebrew home it hung as a reminder of the covenant, as a repetition of the words which it enclosed and which had been given to the people of God on Mount Sinai:

Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.

Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and with thy whole soul and with thy whole strength.

And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thy heart.

And thou shalt tell them to thy children, and thou shalt meditate upon them sitting in thy house, and walking on thy journey, sleeping and rising.

And thou shalt write them in the entry and on the doors of thy house. (Deut. vi, 4-7, 9.)

Such were the words written on the inside of the "Mesusah" and no devout Hebrew ever left his home or entered it without devoutly touching the sacred memorial as he said: *May the Lord guard my going forth and my return, now and forever.* [1] And when the child in its mother's arm heard the sound as the father's hand touching the metal frame which held the venerated memento, and then saw how he reverently kissed the finger that had thus touched it, whilst he uttered a blessing—the little mind's curiosity was awakened and it began to be initiated in the religious practices of the parental home and of God's people. [2] In a similar way will

1 Synagoga Judaica, Buxtorf, xxxi, 582, apud Fretté.

2 Fretté, Vie de N. S. J. C., vol 1, ch. xvi, p. 145, 146.

the image of the Holy Family act upon the Christian child, if its parents habitually reverence it, and perform their devotions morning and night before it. The father leaving his home and returning to it will learn to salute Jesus, Mary and Joseph ; will carry their blessing with him as he goes forth, and will know that wife and child remain safely in the company of that holy trio. But what is more, the image often explained will teach those virtues of contentment, of obedience and resignation to the divine will which are the foundations of domestic happiness and which the false theories of socialists are fast uprooting everywhere.

Already the voices of zealous Bishops here and there who from their watchtowers discern the real dangers and feel how true the instincts of Leo XIII are in his work of universal reform, have been heard. The Bishop of Newport and Menevia in England and the Bishop of Covington in our own country were, I believe, the first to carry out the direction of Leo XIII by taking active measures for an organization of the proposed association of families on the lines of the Pontifical Decree.[1] The pastoral letters of these shepherds set forth the advantages in detail which must come from such an association if rightly cultivated. And in every parish, where it is zealously and judiciously taken hold of, it cannot but prove a strong help to the ready accomplishment of the pastoral work. It is perhaps the most direct answer to the difficulty recently advanced in the United States and presently discussed by the appointed guardians of our faith, the Archbishops and Bishops of the country, namely : *How shall we provide sufficient religious instruction for the children of Catholics who through necessity or otherwise frequent the neutral schools provided by the State?* It is as if the Supreme Pontiff himself answers by saying : Bring Christianity into the homes, hold up to the veneration of the parents of your flock the model family of Nazareth. The fathers and mothers who say their prayers with their little ones morning and night are not the ones who look upon the support of the parochial schools as a superfluous expense. They will not favor or, if they have done so through ignorance, they will not continue to favor a system of education which forces upon their child, already wearied by attendance

1 This Decree with a copy of the Statutes (Italian and English) were published in the last number of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW. In the present we give the additional documents, comprising the letter to the Bishops which accompanied the Decree, and the privileges and indulgences attached to the "Pious Association of the Holy Family," also the formula embodying the act of consecration, and the answer by the S. Cong. of Rites to some doubts regarding the application of the Decree to Religious Communities, etc.

during the regular school hours at secular instruction, an additional hour of drowsy attention to religious instruction whilst other children, not so unfortunate as to have such Catholic parents, may enjoy the freedom and play so needful for their physical as well as moral development. Compromises, even when they do not end in the disgraceful broils and animosities which have recently been reported from Minnesota where the "plan" worked "admirably" and was after three months existence declared to be "a perfect success" so that at least two of our Catholic (?) periodicals went so far as to declare it superior to the parochial school system—such compromises can only serve the interests of the individual. If we should have the misfortune of having them accepted as a permanent arrangement, explicitly endorsed—not merely tolerated—in any part of the country, it needs no prophetic gift to foretell that we shall reap thorns where God gave us ground and seed to plant grapes.

What our growing generation needs more than anything else is sound religious instruction and habits of piety. Patriotism will not be wanting because of it. In the meantime it is within the province of every one who takes part in the warfare of to-day to think seriously before joining in the loudest shout, and also to suggest means and methods which will facilitate uniform action in so important a matter as the preparation and defense of the rights and duties of conscience.

For the purpose of introducing the Association of the Holy Family where it is not already in active operation—as among the Redemptorist Fathers in the United States, who have for years done immense good by it in their parishes[1]—missions are probably the best means. They afford a good opportunity of (*a*) setting forth the purpose of the association, (*b*) inculcating the practices which are its immediate object, (*c*) making the solemn act of consecration by the entire parish. In connection with this there are some points apparently slight, but of radical importance. We mean the introduction of the pictures or representations of the Holy Family into every Catholic household. These should be decidedly beautiful—if possible, in colors—and neatly framed, so as to attract the young. A little stand attached to the frame, holding a lamp or two candles, to be lighted at the time of the devotions, and a card containing the prayer to be

1 The existing societies of the Holy Family are to be considered as affiliations of the one organized under the new statutes contained in the Pontifical Decree.

said in common—these are details of much efficacy in securing proper and permanent attention to this devotion from which so much good fruit is to be expected.

Then there must be periodical public celebrations with a view of reanimating the devotion and aggregating new members. Instructions on the special duties of parents toward each other and their offspring are naturally a becoming part of the programme at such reunions or devotions which take place in the church.

Where the meetings of the different families belonging to the pious union can be held but rarely or with difficulty, it is well to recommend certain books for reading at stated times in the family circle, especially such as throw light upon the domestic duties. It will be easy for any pastor interested in the matter to select a list of such books, and even procure them, to suit the character and needs of his people. Perhaps some thoughtful priest might be induced to publish a collection of short and practical chapters on the domestic duties of the Christian family, adding to it the devotions which properly belong to the association.

How easy it is for most priests to use their influence with young married couples, at the time when these leave the altar, to join in the proposed work of sanctifying their domestic life; to put them in the way of procuring, among the first outfits of their new homes, a picture of the Holy Family suitable to their condition in life, and to give them the little book of instructions on the subject. What theme for the pastor more suitable to connect with the nuptial blessing? He will thus bind the newly married couple more firmly to the Church, will insure beforehand the Christian education of their children, and make them zealous supporters, in most cases, of the cause which he himself finds toilsome in proportion as the aid and sympathy of his people are wanting to him.

What wonder that the Holy Father, foreseeing the wondrous effects of such a work, calls out from his watchtower in earnest, touching tones: "Vigeat floreatque haec pia Consociatio quum sodalium numero, tum recte factorum laude; augeatur et ad plures in dies singulos propagetur: *ea enim florente, facile fides, pietas, et omnis christiana laus in familiis revirescent.*"

P. ARMINIO.

SEVEN DAYS IN QUARANTINE.

Cinque giorne a Chiasso, signore! said the little conductor who examined our tickets as we were approaching the St. Gothard tunnel.

There was no mistake about it. The rumors which had been vaguely repeated at the railway station in Luzerne that morning, but about which none of the officials were able to state anything definite, were true. Passengers from Switzerland to Italy were to be subjected to five days' quarantine.

This was in July 1884, shortly after the first reports of the outbreak of the cholera in Marseilles had spread beyond the borders of France.

A friend who had traveled with me from America was the only other occupant of our coupé. The guard was, as is the fashion with the Italian officials toward foreigners, extremely cautious and answered most of our questions by that inimitable shrug of the shoulders which so irritates the inquirer because he can never determine whether indifference or compassion is the predominant element in the uncertain reply. All that he could or wished to tell us was that passengers for Italy would be detained at Chiasso, and that we had to determine on our arrival at the station whether we would take first or second class quarters, for which it was expected that we would pay, unless we wished to go third, where the *contadini* were lodged in barrack-fashion, at the expense of the Government.

I must confess that, although we had, in setting out from Luzerne that morning, anticipated some difficulty before reaching Milan, there was good reason to hope that the reported rigor of the Italian quarantine would prove an exaggeration, because we did not come from the infected quarter and there was no appearance of cholera as yet in either Germany or Switzerland, whilst the Belgian authorities still allowed travelers to pass unmolested over their frontiers. It appears, however, that the anticipated measure of the Italian Government was not without a species of revenge. The authorities in Turin had, I believe, asked the Swiss to declare quarantine against travelers from France, which was refused on the ground that it would produce a needless and premature scare among the Swiss population. Italy thereupon ordered all travel from Switzerland to be stopped, and persons who desired to proceed were subjected to the species of quarantine which I shall here describe.

It was about 5 P. M., when we alighted at the *gare* in Chiasso. There seemed to be quite a crowd, but I cannot say who or what they were, for we were at once taken in charge by an official and a porter who took our luggage, and all proceeded to a spacious shed whence issued sulphurous fumes. We were thoroughly smoked, that is, as we thought, within a hair-breadth of being stifled to death. Our clothes and baggage were stuffed with bits of sponge saturated in *cloruro di calce* the smell of which is never to be forgotten. It was said—I suppose for effect and with the view of having it reported to the Swiss officials—that lots of people had died from the effects of the fumigation, which, however, was necessary to save Italy.

When the probability of every microbe had been utterly killed, we were huddled off in procession to an omnibus, which stood about a hundred yards away from the station and was drawn by two horses and an ox, which was to take us, in tandem fashion, up the mountain where the *Lazaretto di Quarcino* stood in ominous grandeur.

We had in our party, besides the officer in charge and ourselves, a French family, consisting of a humorous old gentleman and his wife and daughter; a gentleman who had some connection, as he said, with the Government, and was going on business to Rome, expecting to be allowed to pass on next day; a young American, who had for some years resided in Italy, and was on his way back from Paris, where he had been on business. The ride, which would have been pleasant enough at any other time on account of the beautiful scenery, was disagreeable, despite the attempts of one of the party to draw out the ludicrous features of our position. He had evidently escaped with a superficial fumigation, or else had a double set of lungs. We could obtain no detailed information from the guard, who kept his positon at the door of the wagon, as to what fate awaited us. After half an hour's jolting up the rather steep windings of the mountain road, we arrived at the *Lazaretto*, a picturesque old building, half castle, half monastery in appearance, approached by a massive stone gate leading into a courtyard. A throng of eager, half-wild faces looked out upon us from two large entrances of the building proper, barred by iron gratings. I cannot tell just now what strong prejudice possessed me at the time, but the sight of that crowd still haunts me as one of the most repulsive I have ever met.

After alighting, I inquired in French from one of a group of

officers in the yard, whether my friend and I could have a room for ourselves, as we had understood that accommodations were made at the quarantine station to suit the condition of travelers. He answered politely that he was sorry—the station was unexpectedly overfilled—and that they could not possibly place less than eight or nine gentlemen in a single chamber. But if we preferred to go to Luino we could have much better accommodation. Arrangements, he said, had just been made at that station of the cordon to give travelers every facility for proving to the Italian nation, in "la manière la plus comfortable," that they had not brought the cholera from Switzerland.

The journey back to Luino covered more than fifty Italian miles. It was now six o'clock in the evening and we would not be able to get to our proposed quarters until the next day, which was the more disagreeable since we were anxious to make time in getting to Milan, and this delay would probably throw us back another day. We mentioned our fear to the official and asked whether the time thus lost in our transfer could not be placed to our credit, if indeed, there was no other way but to spend five full days in quarantine; especially since this loss was due rather to a want of foresight on the part of the Government in not warning travelers of the overcrowded condition of the quarantine quarter, than to any fault of ours. He shrugged his shoulders and said that the best we could do would be to return at once to Luino. The Government had given the orders and he had no further say in the matter.

The omnibus which had brought us, was to take us back to the depot. How the other travelers who had come with us fared, I do not know; probably better provision was made for the ladies than had been offered us, and the gentlemen might for the time accommodate themselves to circumstances, if, indeed, they did not come to an "understanding" for their release from durance vile with men whom they had from the first appeared to understand much better than we.

The train which we had to take to reach Luino did not leave until late that night. Though half sick with the fumigation and hungry, we were cheered by the thought of being unmolested during our journey until we should reach the station of Luino which formed the passage-way through the Italian cordon. Toward midnight we arrived at Lugano, a pretty city on the lake of the same name. As the next day was Sunday, and the nights only count, as we were told, in quarantine, we concluded to stop here. This would give us

an opportunity of saying Mass, and we could continue our journey in the evening.

On our way to Luino that Sunday afternoon we had to change cars at Giubiasco, where our baggage was examined for contraband goods. Although neither of us was in the habit of smoking, there were four or five cigars in our portmanteau which we had forgotten to declare; these were promptly confiscated by "authority of the Government." In the meantime we had gathered some information as to the quarantine arrangements at Luino. It was said that two thousand men of infantry had been detailed to form a "cordon" along the frontier. Those to whom we had spoken at Chiasso belonged to the 64th Regiment stationed in Milan. They were mostly Neapolitans. The ordinary quarters set apart for quarantine were an enclosed camp near the city, with tents accommodating two or more persons as might be found necessary. For the convenience of first-class passengers, one of the principal hotels had been selected where travelers might stay and have what they wanted, if they paid for it, except liberty to go out.

It occurred to us that it might be more desirable to spend our nights in the tents at Government expense, than to put up at a hotel where accommodations must needs be limited and where we should miss not only the freedom of outdoor life but also intercourse with the poorer class of people which, we then thought, would have its special attraction for us under the circumstances. Indeed our objection at Chiasso had not been so much the crowded condition of the place as the fact that we should not have been able to retire from it at any time; for a priest necessarily desires to have some hours to himself for the purpose of reciting his office, etc. We could certainly put up with poor fare and sleep on mattresses for a few days. In any case we would make the attempt. So when we arrived at Luino, we informed the sergeant who had us fumigated once more, that we wished to encamp *dans la troisième*. He remonstrated and seemed quite concerned, until we told him that if we did not like it we should go to the hotel. The omnibus took us—I think we were alone this time—to the Lazaretto. The establishment proved to be an old stone house in a neglected looking field, with a number of tents scattered over the ground, around which was a low stone wall. There were not many people there; only soldiers, rough looking specimens of the Neapolitan district, who had lost the faith and reverence which they might once have had, under the anti-religious influence of the Piedmontese discipline. Our

conductor humored us in a very friendly way during our brief tour of inspection. He showed us the tents, the kitchen, and the mess-room, and then quietly advised us to take our quarters in the hotel where we should be nicely lodged and away from "these ruffians," from whom nothing was to be learned, except that one must avoid them. We thanked our guide, who proved to be an Austrian physician, and drove to the *Hotel Simplon*, located in one of the most charming spots of upper Italy directly on the eastern border of the *Lago Maggiore.*

The hotel was excellently managed and there was ample room for all the guests, who at this time were in all about thirty, the number growing to about sixty during the week. They were of different nationalities and of nearly every profession,—jurists, merchants, university professors, diplomats, actors, with a sprinkling of ladies and children, some poodle dogs and a parrot. All were bent upon getting quickly into Italy. A gentleman who had come from South America to visit his family, could easily have gained his home on the opposite side of the lake by a plunge and swim across the water, but he had to satisfy himself for full seven days by merely looking at the domestic shrine.

There was a guard stationed at the entrance of the hotel and a number of others at the different garden exits. Every day one of the Government physicians, accompanied by a military officer, came to inqire about the health of the guests. Of course we all considered the matter as a serio-comic entertainment performed by the Italian Government for the benefit of the Swiss at the expense of the traveling public. After we had been in durance vile for three days the announcement was made that the quarantine term was prolonged to *seven* days. The ostensible reason, if I remember right, for this enactment was that an old lady was reported to have died somewhere six days after she had been fumigated. And she had complained of pains in the stomach.

Upon this news being announced—we were all at table—by the doctor, a merchant from Trieste who was on his way to visit the exposition held at the time in Turin, declared his intention of immediately returning to his home instead of awaiting the end of the quarantine. The doctor informed him that this could not be done without authorization from the Government. Both gentlemen lost their temper until the matter ended by a compromise. The order for the release of our friend was to be obtained by telegram. Next day he was allowed to depart, accompanied as far as Guibiasco by a gendarme.

I must confess that, whilst the delay to which we were subjected was disappointing, the life here was very agreeable. The fare was excellent and the charges reasonable ; more so than would have been the case under ordinary circumstances. This fact was due probably, to some stipulation made by the Government for the protection of travelers under its care. The current expenses did not exceed seventy-five francs for each person, which included *Barbera* at dinner, taken by everybody since Dr. Koch had recommended it as a preventative against the cholera.

There was a good library of select Italian and French works in the hotel and the proprietor, too, Sig. Piccardi did everything to make his guests comfortable. We had music indoors and serenades outside, and the days were spent in reading and pleasant conversation under the fig and citron trees which abounded in the pretty garden back of the lodge. Sometimes when everything was quiet in the evening the harmonious sound of voices accompanied by the strains of the mandoline "si la stanchezza m' opprime o figlio !" would rise from the lake whose waters played at our very feet. Thus the monotony of our quarantine-life was varied by the pleasant contrivances of our host, who was, no doubt, anxious to keep a good name for his house which might otherwise have suffered from the fact of its use as a hospice for the time being.

It may be said without exaggeration that the beauty and variety of the scenery around us and of which we had full view from the garden-terrace and the balconies of the hotel, was sufficient to engage the admiration of any lover of nature for a much longer time than was our lot to spend here.

The hotel lies, as has been said, at the very border of the *Lago Maggiore*, with the beautiful town of Luino directly behind it, scaling the mountain. The coast here forms a gentle recess rarely disturbed by the restless dashing of the waters against the neighboring rocks. The town nestles "lieta e sorridente ai piedi di deliziosi poggi e di colli ricchi di bella vegetazione." Toward the southern side, looking from our window along the shore, runs a double row of elms and pines. To the north the rocks rise to gigantic height, and here and there their sloping flanks are covered with vineyards, pretty little gardens, *palazzuoli* and graceful cottages. High above the rest stands, amid the rich foliage of laurel and rhododendron, sycamore and pine trees, a graceful *tempietto* supported on Doric columns of dark granite, reminding you of the classic art of ancient Greece. We had, at a later date, a fair oppor-

tunity of examining in detail the many treasures of sculpture and painting kept in this charming retreat, where Bernardino Luini, the "Raffaello della scuola Lombarda," as he has been called by his countrymen, first saw the light, which years after he knew so beautifully how to reflect in his pictures.

From the balcony in front of the hotel we had a clear view of the opposite coast, studded with pretty villages and palazzine, which shine out like a broken girdle of alabaster from the dense green forest of chestnut trees forming a rich background. Looking across the eye is caught directly by the little town of Cannero, perched above a mount leaning over the edge of the lake. The wealth of vegetation in this delicious climate beggars description. Rich vineyards vary with groves of cedar, orange and fig trees. The air is pure and fragrant with the sweet breath of the lemon and olive. Though snow never touches the ground here, you can plainly see the tinted glitter of the ice-clad mountains beyond; immovable, as though blushing winter were held in check by some guardian spirit of the valley below, on whose bosom plays the lake with the ripple of laughter in its crystal eyes.

At some distance from Cannero where the waves boisterously kiss the bare rocks, may be seen the ruins of a castle, built by Ludovico Borromeo, in the very days of St. Charles, and named after Vitalianus, a royal ancestor of the Borromeo family. Further north lies Cannobio, with its venerable "palazzo della ragione" and the old campanile, dating back to the thirteenth century. Like most of its sister towns in this region it had changed its master many a time in the course of centuries, being lorded over by Italian, Spaniard, and Austrian, at various periods. There are wondrous and thrilling tales told of the sites and castles in this as in other picturesque parts of old Europe, many of which we read of with pleasure during our enforced leisure.

But it will not do to weary the reader by the recital of matters which find a place here only incidentally because they turned our quarantine period to good account.

> Rare belezze di natura io vidi
> E mai di dolce amor acque e campagne,

says an Italian poet of this very spot, and the words were surely inspired by a true feeling.

On Saturday we were told that our term of quarantine would expire on the following day. Accordingly we sent a note to the eccle-

siastical authorities of the town, asking leave to say Mass early on Sunday, since we meant to take the boat that same day for Arona, the birthplace of St. Charles, whence it is but a short journey by rail to Milan. A prompt and kind answer came from the Vicar foraneus informing us that we might celebrate "hora matutina octavam praecedente, in ecclesia B. V. Carmeli dicata vel in ecclesia Majori."

Later we received a pretty document from the medical doctor, who signed himself *Direttore Professore*, declaring under seal of his Majesty the King that "il sotto indicato sconto nello stabilimento in parola *la quarantena prescritta di sette giorne*."

What a pleasant feeling to know that we had really brought no cholera microbes from Switzerland and that we had been able to give guarantee of our physical innocence to the Italian Government. We were glad to thrust a *buonamano* into the outstretched hand of every servant we met to bid us adieu, and might have tempted even the solemn musketeer at the door if we had not feared the penalty attached to attempts at bribing a royal official, though we meant to barter for no more than at most a smile of gratitude.

Later in the season the cholera found its way into Italy. It came, not through Switzerland, but from the port of Naples. Rome was signally spared, though the disease raged close around it, north and south. What kept the scourge away? Sanitary precautions? Yes; but not these alone. The people of Catholic Rome have, it is often said, a faith and trust in God, which is like to no other faith and trust on earth. Perhaps they prayed—not merely to avert the scourge—but to pardon the sins of the people which brought it to them as a reminder that God controls the prosperity of the nations. Such, at least, was the character of the devotions ordained at the time in the city of the Sovereign Pontiff. Shortly before leaving the Holy City that year I was in company of a friend who, speaking to an old Roman dame, suggested the prudence of leaving Rome because of the approaching cholera. In answer she pointed to a picture of our Blessed Lady on the wall saying in a simple way: "The Madonna will protect us." "But," rejoined my companion, "the Madonna is at Marseilles and hundreds of the people are dying there day by day." To which she answered with the look and accent of a child "Ah signore, ma ella non è la Madonna Romana." Whether she knew that a trustful love, such as that of a child toward its mother, begets power from heaven, whereas the fear of a present or impending evil, being mere self love would fail

to move God, who is not our servant but our father, is hard to say. One thing she knew, that to love the Madonna, as she felt the Romans loved her, was to move her compassion and to command her assistance in dire need.

VIATOR CLERICUS.

CONFERENCES

THE ASSOCIATION OF CHRISTIAN FAMILIES.

As stated in the letter of the S. C. R., addressed to the Bishops throughout the Catholic world, (Cf. *Analecta*, of this number) the Holy Father desires that the Association of Christian families as set forth in the Decree and Statutes published in the October number of the REVIEW be established in every parish of every diocese.

Where such Associations or Confraternities of the Holy Family exist already they are to be amalgamated with the newly erected ones, adopting the same form of devotion, unless the prayers and acts previously adopted receive a fresh sanction of the S. Congregation.

With this view the Bishops are requested to inform the superiors of such existing Confraternities or Associations of the changes made in the statutes and privileges.

We give, in this number, all the *acta* referring to the erection of the Association, not already published in the last issue, and shall give a synopsis in English of the privileges connected with it in the next.

THE ASSOCIATION OF THE HOLY FAMILY AND RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES.

The question having been proposed to the S. C. R. as to whether seminaries, colleges and religious communities could properly make the act of consecration to the Holy Family of Nazareth, and thus become partakers of the privileges granted to the Association by the Pontifical Decree, the S. Congregation answered: *Affirmative.* The devotion can therefore be extended to religious communities as well as seminaries and educational institutions generally. (Cf. *Analecta*).

MASS WITHOUT SERVER AND CONGREGATION.

Qu. Is it permissible for a priest to celebrate Mass not only without a a server, but even without any person present during the Holy Sacrifice ?

Resp. "Ministrum Rubrica postulat (De Defect. Tit. x, 1) et ipse ordo celebrationis Missae prout in liturgia praescribitur." *Ballerini, Op. theol. vol. iv. Tr. x, 344.*

St. Alphonsus, answering the question "Quale peccatum sit celebrare sine ministro," says: "Certum est apud omnes, esse mortale ex cap. *Proposuit 6. de fil. presbyt.* ubi dicitur: *Non enim solus presbyter missarum solemnia . . . potest sine ministri suffragio celebrare.*—Verum communiter dicunt Doctores licitum esse celebrare sine ministro urgente necessitate, etc.

Cases of urgent necessity are according to Lehmkuhl (Theol. mor. Vol. ii, 244):

1. The consecration of the Holy Viaticum for the benefit of a dying person.
2. The presence of the people for the purpose of hearing Mass on a holyday of obligation, or
3. The fulfillment of this precept on the part of the celebrant.

However, not only necessity, such as the above-mentioned, but likewise *a special privilege* would exempt a priest, who celebrates Mass without a server, from sin.

The "faculties" usually granted to missionary priests in the United States contain such a privilege "celebrandi—sine ministro—si aliter celebrari non potest." (Facult. ordin. i, 23.)

The question of how to interpret the clause *si aliter celebrari non potest*, as limiting the above-mentioned privilege which usually is given to missionaries in non-Catholic countries, has been repeatedly discussed. P. Schober, whose connection with the S. Congregation of Rites entitles his opinion to special regard, says in his edition of the "Liber de Caeremoniis Missae" (Cap. ii, § 13, note 20) "The faculty of celebrating Mass without a server, which is granted to missionary priests among infidels or heretics, *always supposes a grave necessity.*"

But we have an answer of the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda to the late Bishop Baltes, who in a pastoral instruction dated October 1877, speaks of the meaning which some have attached to the faculty of celebrating Mass "sine ministro" as though it applied only to sundays and holydays, as erroneous. "To remove all doubt" he says "we consulted authorities at Rome on this point. The present Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda answered that this faculty might

be used any day, *if otherwise the priest would have to omit the celebration of Mass.*" (Past. Inst. ii, n. 69.)

There is no doubt that the same reasons which allow a priest to dispense with a server, also permit the celebration of Mass without any other person present in the church; for the purpose of the Holy Sacrifice offered in behalf of the entire Church is fulfilled by the intention with which the celebrant answers the prayers otherwise placed in the mouth of the server; just as he does when he recites the Office, privately saying "Venite adoremus" and making at the same time the response.

It is evident, however, from the whole tenor of legislation on this subject, that to dispense with a server, from mere reasons of convenience, is, as the Bishop of Alton puts it, an abuse which should not be tolerated by any priest in his own church, "unless it happen seldom and from causes which cannot be avoided." (Past. Instr. l. c.)

REQUIEM MASSES AND THE ROMAN ORDO.

Qu. Is there any general privilege by which priests who use the Roman Ordo may celebrate two Requiem Masses during the week, even on double feasts. I have seen it done in different dioceses, but never could obtain any other reason from those who used this privilege than that it is a general custom for those who say the Roman Office. Will you please give me some authoriy for this practice, if it has a sanction, or suggest how the privilege may be obtained?

Resp. The privilege referred to is not attached in any way to the right of using the Roman Ordo; but it happens to be a privilege *generally* obtained for such dioceses in which the *Roman* Ordo is introduced for the entire secular clergy. Such is the case, for instance, in Cincinnati, where the *Roman* Ordo is in common use, and where there exists *at the same time* a special indult permitting the celebration of two Requiem Masses each week, even on double feasts, unless they be Dupl. I and II, cl., Dupl. maj., or privileged ferials, vigils and octaves. The indult was, it is true, obtained mainly because of the general use of the Roman Ordo in the diocese, as the frequent occurrence of double feasts in the Roman calendar allowed but few opportunities for saying private Requiem Masses according to the general Rubrics; but beyond this it is an entirely separate privilege. Similar indults were obtained for the

dioceses of St. Louis, Milwaukee, etc. Personal application for the same may made through the Bishop to the Propaganda in some such form as the following :

BEATISSIME PATER :—N. N. presbyter (vicarius ad S. N.), loci N. diocesis N. ad pedes Sanctitatis Vestrae provolutus, humiliter petit pro se facultatem celebrandi missam privatam de *Requiem* cum privilegio altaris duabus diebus in quacumque hebdomada, etiam occurrente ritu duplici, exceptis Dominicis, festis I et II cl., vigiliis, feriis, octavisque privilegiatis (ob rationes ab iis allatas qui in his regionibus officium juxta Kalendarium cleri Romani persolvunt). Pro qua gratia gratias maximas aget ea qua par est reverentia et veneratione Sanctitati Vestrae.

Filius etc.,

N. N.

THE RITUAL AT FUNERALS.

Qu. I would request you to answer the following queries regarding the Rubrics at funeral services.

I. When no Mass is said or sung at the funeral, is the celebrant obliged to sing the parts marked in the Rubrics as "cantat" or "cantatur" or may they be simply recited ?

II. What parts of the Ritual are essential in the celebration of funerals without Mass ?

Resp. I. Rubricists agree that "deficientibus ministris" the prayers of the Ritual prescribed for funerals may be *recited.*

II. All the prayers from the *Subvenite* included to the prayer *Fac quaesumus* with the *responses* and *versicles* following. If the grave is already blessed the prayer *Deus cujus miseratione* (before the "Benedictus") is omitted.

ANALECTA.

EPISTOLA ENCYCLICA —Ad Patriarchas Primates Archiepiscopos Episcopos Aliosque Locorvm Ordinarios Pacem et Commvnionem cvm Apostolica Sede Habentes.

DE ROSARIO MARIALI.

VENERABILIBVS FRATRIBVS PATRIARCHIS PRIMATIBVS ARCHIEPISCOPIS ET EPISCOPIS ALIISQVE LOCORVM ORDINARIIS PACEM ET COMMVNIONEM CVM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTIBVS.

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES.

Salvtem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

Magnae Dei Matris amorem et cultum quoties ex occasione liceat excitare in christiano populo et augere, toties Nos mirifica voluptate et laetitia perfundimur, tamquam de ea re quae non solum per se ipsa praestantissima est multisque modis frugifera, sed etiam cum intimo animi Nostri sensu suavissime concinit. Sancta nimirum erga Mariam pietas, semel ut paene cum lacte suximus, crescente aetate, succrevit alacris valuitque in animo firmius : eo namque illustrius menti apparebat quanto illa esset et amore et honore digna, quam Deus ipse amavit et dilexit primus, atque ita dilexit, ut unam ex universitate rerum sublimius evectam amplissimisque ornatam muneribus sibi adiunxerit matrem. Eius autem bonitatis in Nos beneficentiaeque complura et splendida testimonia, quae summa cum gratia nec sine lacrimis recordamur, eamdem in Nobis pietatem et foverunt amplius et vehementius incendunt. Per multa enim et varia et formidolosa quae inciderunt tempora, semper ad eam confugimus, semper ad eam intentis oculis cupidisque suspeximus; omnique spe et metu, laetitiis et acerbitatibus, in sinu eius depositis, haec fuit assidua cura, orandi ab ea, Nobis vellet benigna in modum matris per omne tempus adesse et illud impetrare eximium, posse Nos ei vicissim deditissimam filii voluntatem probare. Ubi deinde arcano providentis Dei consilio est factum, ut ad hanc Beati Petri Cathedram, ad ipsam videlicet Christi personam in eius Ecclesia gerendam, assumeremur, tum vero ingenti muneris gravitate commoti, nec ulla sustentati fiducia virtutis Nostrae, subsidia divinae opis, in materna Virginis beatissimae fide, impensiore studio flagitare contendimus. Spes autem Nostra, gestit animus profiteri, quum in omni vita, tum maxime in supremo Apostolatu fungendo, eventu rerum numquam non habuit fructum vel levamentum. Ex quo spes eadem Nobis multo nunc surgit erectior ad plura maioraque, auspice illa et conciliatrice, expetenda, quae pariter saluti

christiani gregis atque Ecclesiae gloriae felicibus incrementis proficiant Est igitur recte opportuneque, Venerabiles Fratres, quod incitamenta quaedam universis filiis Nostris, renovata per vos hortatione, adhibeamus, ut octobrem proximum, Dominae nostrae et Reginae augustae a *Rosario* sacrum, vividiore pietatis sollertia, quam necessitates ingravescentes exposcunt, studeant celebrare.

Quam multis et quibus corruptelarum modis nequitia saeculi eo fallaciter connitatur ut christianam fidem et, quae ipsam nutrit movetque in fructus, observantiam divinae legis, debilitet ac prorsus evellat ex animis, iam patet nimium: iamque passim dominicus ager, teterrima velut afflatus lue, ignoratione fidei, erroribus, vitiis propemodum silvescit. Quod vero ad cogitandum acerbius est, improbitati tam arroganti et noxiae tantum abest ut frena iniecta aut iustae sint poenae impositae ab iis qui possunt maximeque debent, ut immo saepius ex ipsorum vel socordia vel patrocinio augeri spiritus videantur. Inde est cum causa dolendum de publicis doctrinarum et artium palaestris sic dedita opera constitutis, in quibus nomen conticescat aut vituperetur Dei; dolendum de impudentiore in dies licentia quidlibet in vulgus edendi, quidlibet declamandi Christo Deo et Ecclesiae probrosum; neque ea minus dolenda consecuta in multis remissio et desidia catholicae professionis, quae si non aperta est a fide defectio, eo certe evasura procliviter est, cum fide nihil iam vitae habitu congruente. Quam qui perpendat maximarum rerum confusionem et labem, non ei perfecto fuerit mirum, si late gentes divinae animadversionis pondere ingemiscant afflictae, metuque graviorum calamitatum anxiae trepidae teneantur.

Iamvero ad violatum Dei numen placandum, ad eamque afferendam quae misere laborantibus opus est sanationem, nihil sane valuerit melius quam pie perseveranterque precandi officium, modo sit cum studio et actione christianae vitae coniunctum: quod utraque in parte ducimus per *mariale Rosarium* potissime assequendum. Ab ipsa rei satis cognita origine, quam praeclara monumenta illustrant et commemoravimus Ipsi non semel, praepotens vis eius laudatur. Quo enim tempore Albigensium secta, integritatis fidei morumque specie quidem fautrix, re vera perturbatrix pessima et corruptrix, magno multis gentibus erat exitio, in eam consceleratasque factiones pugnavit Ecclesia, non copiis neque armis, sed interposita praecipue sacratissimi Rosarii virtute, cuius ritum ipsa Dominico parti Deipara tradidit propagandum: atque ita de omnibus magnifice victrix, suorum saluti, tum per eam, tum per similes deinceps procellas, exitu semper glorioso consuluit. Quamobrem in hoc rerum et hominum cursu quem conquerimur, luctuosum religioni, perniciosissimum rei publicae, pari omnes pietate sanctam Dei Genitricem communiter implorare exorare oportet, ut eamdem eius Rosarii virtutem secundum vota laetemur experti. Enimvero quum precando confugimus ad Mariam, ad Matrem Misericordiae confugimus, ita in nos affectam, ut qualicumque necessitate, ad immortalis praesertim vitae adeptionem, premamur, illico nobis et ultro, ne vocata quidem, praesto sit semper, atque de thesauro largiatur illius gratiae qua inde ab initio donata est plenâ copia a Deo, digna ut eius mater existeret. Hac scilicet gratiae copia, quae in multis Virginis laudibus est praeclarissima, longe ipsa cunctis hominum et angelorum ordinibus ante-

cellit, Christo una omnium proxima: *Magnum enim est in quolibet sancto, quando habet tantum de gratia quod sufficit ad salutem multorum: sed quando haberet tantum, quod sufficeret ad salutem omnium hominum de mundo, hoc esset maximum; et hoc est in Christo et in Beata Virgine* (1). Ei nos igitur, quum gratia plenam angelico praeconio salutamus, eamdemque iteratam laudem in coronas rite connectimus, dici vix potest quam gratum optatumque fecerimus: toties enim a nobis memoria quasi excitatur tum dignitatis eius excelsae, tum initae a Deo per ipsam humani generis redemptionis; unde etiam commemorata pendet divina et perpetua necessitudo, qua ipsa cum Christi gaudiis et doloribus, opprobriis et triumphis tenetur in regendis hominibus iuvandisque ad aeterna. Quod si Christo benignissime placuit tantam nostri praeseferre similitudinem; seque hominis filium atque adeo fratrem nostrum dicere et praebere, quo testatior sua in nos misericordia patesceret, *Debuit per omnia fratribus similari, ut misericors fieret.*[2] Mariae non aliter, ex eo quod Christi Domini eiusdemque fratris nostri electa est mater, hoc supra matres omnes singulare inditum est, ut misericordiam nobis proderet effunderet suam. Id praeterea si debemus Christo quod nobiscum ius sibi proprium quodammodo communicarit, Deum vocandi et habendi patrem, eidem similiter debemus communicatum amantissime ius, Mariam vocandi et habendi matrem. Quando autem natura ipsa nomen matris fecit dulcissimum, in eaque exemplar quasi statuit amoris teneri et providentis, lingua quidem haud satis eloqui potest, at probe sentiunt piorum animi, quanta in Maria insideat benevolentis actuosaeque ceritatis flamma, in ea nimirum, quae nobis, non humanitus, sed a Christo est mater. Atque multo illa magis nostra omnia habet cognita et perspecta; quibus ad vitam indigeamus praesidiis, quae impendeant publice privatim pericula, quibus in angustiis in malis versemur, quam in primis sit acris cum acerrimis hostibus de salute animae dimicatio: in his autem aliisve asperitatibus vitae, multo ipsa potest largius, et vehementius exoptat, solatium, robur, auxilia omne genus carissimis filiis afferre. Itaque ad Mariam non timide non remisse adeamus, per illa obsecrantes materna vincula, quibus cum Iesu itemque nobiscum coniunctissima est; praesentem eius opem quo precationis modo significavit ipsa et peracceptum habet, religiosissime invocemus: tum erit merito in tutela optimae matris securis laetisque animis conquiescendum.

Ad hanc Rosarii commendation ex precatione ipsa profectam, accedit ut in eodem insit facilis quidam usus ad summa fidei christianae capita suadenda animis et inculcanda; quae quidem alia est nobilissima commendatio. Est enim maxime ex fide quod homo recte certeque gradus facit ad Deum, eiusque unius maiestatem immensam, imperium in omnia, summam potentiam, sapientiam providentiam discit mente et animo revereri: *Credere enim oportet accedentem ad Deum quia est, et inquirentibus se remunerator sit.*[3] Quoniam porro aeternus Dei Filius humanitatem suscepit, praeluxitque nobis et adest velut via, veritas, vita, idcirco fides nostra praeterea complectatur necesse est Trinitatis divinarum personarum augustae et Unigenae Patris hominis facti alta mysteria: *Haec est*

1 S. Th. *op.* viii *super salut. angelica.* 2 *Hebr.* ii, 17. 3 *Hebr.* xi, 6.

vita aeterna, ut cognoscant te, solum Deum verum, et quem misisti Iesum Christum.[1] Permagno quidem beneficio donavit nos Deus, quum fide hac sancta donavit: cuius munere non solum supra humana erigimur, tamquam speculatores effecti et consortes divinae naturae, sed habemus hoc amplius causam praestantis meriti ad praemia caelestia; proptereaque spes nostra alitur et confirmatur, fore aliquando ut Deum, non iam per adumbratas rerum imagines, sed aperto in lumine contingat intueri ipsum ipsoque fruit ultimo bono perpetuum. At vero christianus homo tam variis distinetur vitae curis tamque evagatur facile ad levia, ut, nisi crebra admonitio succurrat, quae maxima et pernecessaria sunt oblivione lenta dediscat, ob eamque causam eius oblanguescat atque etiam intercidat fides. Quae nimis magna ignorantiae pericula ut a filiis suis Ecclesia prohibeat, nulla sane vigilantiae diligentiaeque praetermittit consilia, neque ultimum est fidei adiumentum quod ex mariali Rosario petere consuevit. Quippe in eo, cum pulcherrima fructuosaque prece certo ordine continuata, recolenda succedunt et contemplanda praecipua religionis nostrae mysteria: illa primum quibus *Verbum caro factum est*, et Maria, virgo integra et mater, materna illi officia sancto cum gaudio praestitit; tum Christi dolentis aegritudines, cruciatus, supplicium, quorum pretio salus generis nostri peracta; tum eiusdem plena gloriae mysteria, et de morte triumphus, et ascensus in caelum, et demissus inde divinus Spiritus, atque Mariae sideribus receptae splendida claritudo, denique cum gloria Matris et Filii consociata caelitum omnium gloria sempiterna. Haec rerum plane admirabilium contexta series in fidelium mentes frequenter assidueque revocatur, et fere in conspectu explicata proponitur: id quod Rosarium sancte colentibus aspergit animos nova semper quadam pietatis dulcedine, perinde afficiens et movens quasi vocem ipsam exciperent indulgentissimae Matris, eadem aperientis mysteria multaque salutariter alloquentis. Quare non id nimis affirmatum videbitur, quibus et locis et familiis et gentibus honorem pristinum marialis Rosarii consuetudo retineat, nullam ibi iacturam fidei ab ignorantia pestiferisque erroribus metuendam.

Sed alia non minus praestat, quam Ecclesia filiis suis magnopere a Rosario quaerit, utilitas; ea est, ut ad fidei sanctae normam et praescripta vitam moresque suos diligentius componant. Si enim, ut omnes tenent divinum effatum: *Fides sine operibus mortua est* [2] eo quia fides vitam ducit a caritate, caritas autem in ubertatem exit sanctarum actionum; nihil profecto emolumenti ad aeterna christianus homo percepturus erit ex fide sua, nisi rationum vitae secundum eam direxerit: *Quid proderit, fratres mai, si fidem quis dicat se habere, opera autem non habeat? numquid poterit fides salvare eum?* [3] Istud immo hominum genus reprehensionem Christi iudicis multo graviorem incurret, quam qui christianae fidei disciplinaeque sint misere ignari: qui non, ut illi perperam, aliter credunt aliter vivunt, verum quia carent Evangelii lumine, habent ideo quamdam execusationem aut minore sunt certe in noxa. Quo igitur fides quam profitemur consentanea fructuum laetitia melius florescat, simul ex mysteriis ipsis quae mens considerando persequitur, ad virtutum proposita

1 Ioann. xvii, 3. 2 Iac. ii, 20. 3 *Ib.* 14.

mire animus inflammatur. Opus nempe salutiferum Christi Domini, quale nobis eminet ac nitet in omnes partes exemplum! Magnus omnipotens Deus, urgente in nos nimia caritate, ad infirmi hominis conditionem sese extenuat; nobiscum velut unus de multis versatur, amice colloquitur, singulos et turbam ad omnem erudit docetque iustitiam, excellens sermone magister, auctoritate Deus. Omnibus omnino se dat beneficum; e morbis corporum relevat languentes, morbisque animorum gravioribus paterna medetur miseratione: quos vel aerumna exercet vel sollicitudinum moles fatigat, eos in primis blandissime compellat et vocat: *Venite od me omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis, et ego reficiam vos.*[1] Tum ipse interquiescentibus nobis in complexu suo, de illo spirat mystico igne quem ad homines detulit, deque sui mansuetudine animi ac submissione benigne insinuat, quarum usu virtutum nos optat verae solidaeque pacis, cuius, est auctor, participes: *Discite a me quia mitis sum et humilis corde; et invenietis requiem animabus vestris.*[2] Sed ipse tamen, pro ea sapientiae caelestis luce et insigni beneficiorum copia quibus homines demereri debuerat, hominum subit odia iniuriasque atrocissimas, atque sanguinem et spiritum cruci suffixus profundit, nihil spectans enixius quam ut illis pariat sua morte vitam. Talia peramantis Redemptoris nostri monumenta carissima nequaquam fieri potest ut quispiam attenta secum cogitatione reputet et commentetur, neque grata adversus eum voluntate exardescat. At verius probatae vis fidei tantum efficiet ut, illuminata hominis mente et animo vehementer impulso, totum prope rapiat ad ipsius Christi vestigia per omne discrimen sectanda, ad eam usque Paulo dignam obtestationem: *Quis ergo nos separabit a caritate Christi? tribulatio, an angustia, an fames, an nuditas, an periculum, an persecutio, an gladius?...*[3] *Vivo autem iam non ego; vivit vero in me Christus.*[4]

Ne vero ad exempla quae Christus, homo idemque Deus, de se exhibet sane quam maxima, nativae nos imbecillitatis conscientia absterriti deficiamus, una cum mysteriis eius mysteria Matris sanctissimae habemus oculis mentis ad contemplandum oblata. Egregia Davidis stirpe est ea quidem progenita, cui tamen nihil iam est reliquum de maiorum vel opibus vel amplitudine; quae vitam in obscuro agit, humili in oppido, humiliore in tecto, recessu ipso et rei familiaris tenuitate eo contenta magis quod liberiore potest animo se tollere ad Deum eidemque summo desideratissimo bono penitus adhaerere. Atqui est cum ipsa Dominus, quam complet et beata gratiâ sua; ipsaque, allato caelesti nuntio, designatur, ex qua, virtute agente Spiritus Sancti, expectatus ille Servator gentium nostra in humanitate sit proditurus. Celsissimum dignitatis gradum quanto plus ea miratur et muneri tribuit potenti misericordique Deo, tanto se, nullius sibi conscia virtutis, deprimit, humilius, seque Dei ancillam, eius dum fit mater, prompto animo edicit et devovet. Quod autem pollicita sancte est, id alacris sancte praestat, iam tum perpetua cum Iesu filio, ad gaudia ad lacrimas, communione vitae instituta. Sic tale fastigium gloriae, ut nemo alius nec homo nec angelus, obtinebit, quia cum ipsa nemo erit virtutum promeritis conferendus; sic eam superi et mundani regni manet corono, quod

1 Matth. xi, 28. 2 *Ib.* 29. 3 *Rom.* viii, 35. 4 *Gal.* ii, 20.

invicta futura sit regina martyrum ; sic in caelesti Dei civitate per aeternitatem omnem coronata assidebit ad Filium, quod constanter per omnem vitam, constantissime in Calvaria, redundantem tristitia calicem sit cum illo exhaustura. Ecce autem in Maria virtutis omnis examplar vere bonus et providens Deus constituit nobis aptissimum ; eamque oculis et cogitatione intuentest non animus, quasi divini numinis fulgore perstricti, despondemus, sed ex ipsa allecti communis propinquitate naturae, fidentius ad imitationem enitimur. Cui studio si nos, ea maxime adiuvante, totos dediderimus, licebit profecto virtutis tantae sanctitatisque lineamenta saltem exprimere, et quam admirabiliter tenuit ad omnia Dei consilia aequabilitatem vitae, referentes, ipsam licebit subsequi ad caelum. Iam nos peregrinationem eo susceptam, quamvis aspera multisque sit difficultatibus impedita, animose fortiterque insastamus ; neve molestiam inter et laborem cessemus tendere ad Mariam suppliciter manus in eas Ecclesiae voces : *Ad te suspiramus gementes et flentes in hac lacrimarum valle . . . illos tuos misericordes oculos ad nos converte ; Vitam praesta puram, iter para tutum, ut videntes Iesum, semper collaetemur.* At illa, quae, tametsi nullam in se passa debilitatem naturae nostrae vitiositatemque pernoscit, quaeque matrum omnium est optima et studiosissima, quam nobis opportune prolixeque subveniet, quanta et caritate reficiet et virtute firmabit ! Per iter euntibus, divino Christi sanguine et Mariae lacrimis consecratum, certus erit nobis nec difficilis exitus ad societatem quoque beatissimae eorum gloriae fruendam.

Ergo Rosarium Mariae Virginis, in quo apte utiliterque habentur coniuncta et eximia precationis formula et idoneum fidei conservandae instrumentum et insigne specimen perfectae virtutis, dignum plane est quod veri nominis christianis sit frequenter in manibus piaque recitatione et meditatione colatur. Haec autem commendata singulariter volumus ei *Consociationi*, quam nuper etiam laudavimus legitimeque probavimus, *a Sacra Familia* appellatam. Si quidem illud Christi Domini mysterium, quod vitam intra parietes Nazarethanae domus tacitam abditamque diu transegerit, eidem Consociationi dat causam, ita ut ad exemplar Familiae sanctissimae divinitus constitutae sese christianae familiae curent sedulo conformare, iam eius perspicua est cum Rosario singularis quaedam coniunctio ; qua praesertim attinet ad mysteria gaudiorum, in eo ipso conclusa quum Iesus, post declaratam in templo sapientiam suam, cum Maria et Iosepho *venit Nazareth et erat subditus illis*, cetera quasi instruens mysteria, quae hominum doctrinam et redemptionem propius efficerent. Quare videant Consociati omnes quam sit suum, cultores Rosarii atque etiam propagatores sese diligentes praebere.

Quantum est ex Nobis, rata firmaque habemus sacrae indulgentiae munera, superioribus annis concessa, eorum gratiâ qui octobrem mensem rite ad ea ipsa praescripta egerint : vestrae autem, Venerabiles Fratres, auctoritati et sollertiae valde tribuimus, ut par atque antea in catholicis gentibus caleat religio et contentio sancta ad Virginem, Christianorum Adiutricem, Rosarii prece colendam. At vero, unde exorsa est cohortatio Nostra,

1 *Ex. sacr. liturg.*

inde placet ad exitum pergat, iterum apertiusque testando quem fovemus erga magnam Dei Genitricem animum et memorem beneficiorum et spei plenum laetissimae. Suffragia christiani populi ad eius aras pientissime supplicantis aeque rogamus Ecclesiae causâ, tam adversis turbulentisque iactatae temporibus, aeque rogamus causâ Nostra, qui devexa aetate, defessi laboribus, difficillimis rerum constricti angustiis, nullis hominum fulti subsidiis, ipsius gubernacula Ecclesiae tractamus. Nempe in Maria, potente et benigna matre, spes Nostra exploratior quotidie augescit, iucundius arridet. Cuius deprecationi si plurima eaque praeclara beneficia a Deo accepta referimus, id quoque effusiore gratia referimus quod iamiam detur quinquagesimum diem anniversarium attingere ex quo sumus episcopali ordine consecrati. Magnum sane hoc est respicientibus tam diuturnum pastoralis muneris spatium, quantum praecipue, quotidiana sollicitudine agitatum, adhuc impendimus christiano gregi universo regendo. Quo Nobis in spatio, ut est hominum vita, ut sunt Christi et Matris mysteria, nec defuerunt gaudiorum causae, et plures acerbaeque admixtae sunt causae dolorum, gloriandi in Christo praemiis quoque delatis: eaque Nos omnia, demissa Deo aequaliter mente gratoque animo, convertere ad Ecclesiae bonum et ornamentum studuimus. Nunc iam, nec enim dissimiliter reliqua vita decurret, si vel nova affulgeant gaudia vel impendeant dolores, siqua gloriae accessura sint decora, eâdem Nos mente eodemque animo constantes, et gloriam unice appetentes a Deo caelestem, davidica illa iuvabunt: *Sit nomen Domini benedictum: Non nobis, Domine, non nobis, sed nomini tuo da gloriam.* [1] Equidem a filiis Nostris, quorum in Nos videmus studia tam pie et benevole incensa, potius quam gratulationes et laudes, summas Deo optimo grates precesque et vota magnopere expectamus; maxime laetati si hoc Nobis impetrent, ut quantum virium et vitae supersit, quantum resideat auctoritatis et gratiae, tantum Ecclesiae omnino accidat salutare, in primis ad infensos et devios, quos iamdudum vox Nostra invitat, reducendos reconciliandos. Omnibus autem dilectissimis filiis, ex proxima, Deo donante faustitate et laetitia Nostra, iustitiam, pacis, prosperitatis, sanctimoniae, bonorum omnium affluant munera: hoc paterna caritate a Deo adprecamur, hoc eloquiis eius commonemus: *Obaudite me .....et quasi rosa plantata super rivos aquarum fructificate: quasi Libanus odorem suavitatis habete. Florete flores quasi lilium, et date odorem et frondete in gratiam, et collaudate canticum et benedicite Dominum in operibus suis. Date nomini eius magnificentiam, et confitemini illi in voce labiorum vestrorum et in canticis et citharis.....in omni corde et ore collaudate et benedicite nomen Domini.*

Quibus consiliis et optatis si forte illuserint nefarii homines, qui *quaecumque ignorant, blasphemant*, parcat illis clementer Deus; ut ipse autem propitius, exorante sacratissimi Rosarii Regina, obsecundet, habete auspicium, Venerabiles Fratres, idemque pignus benevolentiae Nostrae, Apostolicam benedictionem, quam singulis vobis et clero populoque vestro peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die VIII septembris anno MDCCCXCII, Pontificatus Nostri quintodecimo.

LEO PP. XIII.

1 Ps. cxiii, 2, cxiii, 1.

LITTERAE CIRCULARES.

S. RIT. CONGR. AD EPISCOPOS.

De Conscociatione s. Familiae.

RME DOMINE UTI FRATER :

Quo ubique terrarum cultus ac devotio erga Sacram Familiam magis magisque foveatur, atque a propria indole ac natura nunquam deflectat, Ssmus Dominus Noster Leo Papa XIII universalem Consociationem appositis statutis per Sacram Rituum Congregationem nuper exaratis constituendam voluit, quam indulgentiarum quoque thesauro locupletare dignatus est. Haec omnia in Apostolicis Litteris in forma Brevis continentur, quae de mandato Sanctitatis Suae per presentem epistolam ad Amplitudinem Tuam transmittuntur, quibus additur decretum ipsius Sacrae Congregationis ab eadem Sanctitate Sua adprobatum, quo nonnulla hac super re declarantur.

Erit itaque Amplitudinis Tuae tam salutarem institutionem apud commissos Tibi Fideles omni studio excitare ac promovere ; ita ut in unaquaque Parochiali tuae Dioeceseos Ecclesia sub respectivi Parochi regimine, ad tramitem supradicti Apostolici Brevis, christianarum familiarum consociatio habeatur.

Hoc autem animadvertat Amplitudo Tua, quod si aliae in tua Dioecesi erectae reperiantur Societates ejusdem nominis et instituti, illae amplius existere nequeunt, sed cum hac universali ita conjungi debent, ut unum evadant corpus cum ipsa. Praeterea quaecumque preces seu orationes, etsi indulgentiis ditatae, ibidem usurpantur, nova indigent hujus Sacrae Rituum Congregationis adprobatione ; secus in posterum licite adhiberi nequeunt.

Si vero in ista Dioecesi extent Religiosae Familiae sub hoc ipso titulo, Amplitudo Tua eorum Superiores de praesentibus Apostolicae Sedis dispositionibus ac statutis certiores reddere satagat.

Quae dum pro mei muneris ratione Amplitudini Tuae communico, Eidem diuturnam ex animo felicitatem adprecor.

Amplitudinis Tuae

Uti Frater

CAJ. *Card.* ALOISI MASELLA *S. R. C. Praefectus.*

VINC. NUSSI, *S. R. C. Secretarius.*

Romae die 2 Julii, 1892.

PRIVILEGIA ET INDULGENTIAE CONCESSAE PIAE CONSOCIATIONI S. FAMILIAE.

LEO PAPA XIII.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.

Quum nuper Nobis obtigisset, ut nova Statuta Consociationis Sacrae Familiae Apostolicis litteris probaremus et sancir emus, satis muneri atque Officio Nostro facturos esse duximus, si eandem Consociationem amplissimis verbis collaudaremus, eamque christianis Familiis summopere com-

mendaremus. Laudavimus autem, et commendavimus ea voluntate eoque proposito, ut nimirum populus christianus, cuius aeterna salus est Nobis commissa, ad christianarum virtutum laudem exemplo sacrae Familiae et invitatione Nostra tempestive revocarentur. Christiana quippe virtus tam est efficax, tantumque pollet, ut in ea magnam partem posita sit vel sanatio malorum, quae premunt, vel depulsio periculorum, quae metuuntur. Ad virtutem vero mirifice excitantur homines exemplo: quod quidem eo magis imitatione dignum iudicatur, quo integrior et sanctior est persona, unde petitur. Quare haud mirum est si Nos, qui nihil magis cupimus atque optamus, quam posse, excitata ubique virtute christiana, praesentibus malis mederi, et proxima pericula deprecari, Consociationem Sacrae Familiae singulari benevolentia et studio prosequimur, utpote quae sanctitatem divinae illius Familiae sibi proponit exemplar. Omnes enim ii, qui in huiusmodi Consociationem adsciti sunt, praeclarissimas Iesu, Mariae, et Ioseph virtutes contemplantes, necesse est ut similitudinem earum aliquam adripiant, fierique studeant imitatione meliores. Quare vigeat floreatque haec pia Consociatio quum sodalium numero, tum recte factorum laude; augeatur et ad plures in dies singulos propagetur: ea enim florente, facile fides, pietas, et omnis christiana laus in Familiis revirescent. Quum vero soleant homines permoveri maxime praemio; Nos, quod in facultate Nostra est, praemium spiritualium bonorum, non quidem fragile et caducum, illis, quasi invitamentum, proponimus. Ceterum maiora expectent ab iis, quibus se devoverunt, nimirum a Iesu, Maria, et Ioseph, qui sint servis suis praesentes propitii in omni vitae cursu, et postmodum efficiant, ut sua sanctissima ac suavissima nomina illorum morientium labris insideant. Quare quod bonum sanctumque sit, Deique gloriae, et animarum saluti benevertat, Nos auctoritate Nostra Apostolica, his litteris, poenarum remissionibus seu indulgentiis, privilegiisque, quae infra in apposito indice recensentur, omnes et singulos sodales Consociationis Sacrae Familiae tam praesentes, quam futuros, uti posse volumus et iubemus.

INDEX INDULGENTIARUM ET PRIVILEGIORUM.

PIAE CONSOCIATIONI SACRAE FAMILIAE TRIBUENDORUM.

Indulgentiae Plenariae.

Sodalibus Consociationis Sacrae Familiae ex utroque sexu singulis, qui admissorum confessione ritu christiano expiati sacram Eucharistiam sumpserint, et Parochialem aedem, vel oratorium publicum, devote visitaverint, ibique aliquandiu ad mentem Nostram orando perstiterint, indulgentiam plenariam consequendi ius esto diebus, qui infra scripti sunt.

I. Die quo Consociationem adierint, emissa Consecrationis formula, a Nobis, per Nostram Rituum Congregationem probatam, et in fine huius indicis relata.

II. Quo die in anno generalis conventus habebitur, iuxta cuiusque loci, in quo extat Consociatio, consuetudinem, ad sodalium pactum renovandum.

III. Diebus festivitatum

1.—Nativitatis
2.—Circumcisionis
3.—Epiphaniae
4.—Resurrectionis
5.—Ascensionis
} D. N. I. C.

6.—Immaculatae Conceptionis
7.—Nativitatis
8.—Annuntiationis
9.—Purificationis
10.—Assumptionis
} B. M. V.

Item diebus festis

11.—S. Ioseph Sponsi B. M. V. die undevigesima mensis Martii.

12.— Patrocinii eiusdem, Dominica tertia post Pascha.

13.—Desponsationis B. M. V die vigesima tertia mensis Ianuarii.

IV. Die festo titulari universae Consociationis.

V. Die per menses singulos sodalium arbitrio eligendo, dummodo mense ipso in Familiis praescriptas preces coram Sacrae Familiae imagine una simul recitaverint.

VI. Morituris si, non compotes sacra Confessione atque Eucharistia, animi dolore culpas expiaverint, et sanctum nomen Iesu, aut voce, aut si loqui posse desierint, voluntate imploraverint.

Partiales.

I.

Sodales Consociationis Sacrae Familae ex utroque sexu singuli, qui corde saltem contriti Parochialem Ecclesiam, in qua est sedes Consociationis constituta, vel aliquod templum sacrariumve celebraverint, Deoque pro rei christianae incolumitate supplicaverint lucrari possint et valeant partiales indulgentias septem annorum totidemque quadragenarum.

1.—Die Visitationis
2.—Die Praesentationis
3.—Die Patrocinii
} B. M. V.

4.—Quolibet die iidem sodales una simul in propriis Familiis adscriptis congregati, ante imaginem sacrae Familiae statas preces corde contrito recitaverint.

5.—Diebus, quibus sodales interfuerint conventibus, quos haberi contigerit.

II.

Iidem sodales indulgentias lucrentur trecentorum dierum quoties corde contrito sequentem Orationem ante imaginem Sacrae Familiae quocumque idiomate recitaverint.

ORATIO.

Quotidie Recitanda Ante Imaginem Sacrae Familiae.

"O amantissime Iesu, qui ineffabilibus tuis virtutibus et vitae domesticae exemplis Familiam a te electam in terris consecrasti, clementer aspice nostram hanc domum, quae ad tuos pedes provoluta propitium te sibi deprecatur. Memento tuam esse hanc domum ; quoniam tibi se peculiari cultu sacravit ac devovit. Ipsam benignus tuere, a periculis eripe, ipsi in necessitatibus occurre, et virtutem largire, qua in imitatione Familiae tuae sanc-

tae iugiter perseveret; ut mortalis suae vitae tempore in tui obsequio et amore fideliter inhaerens, valeat tandem aeternas tibi laudes persolvere in caelis.

"O Maria, Mater dulcissima, tuum praesidium imploramus, certi divinum tuum Unigenitum precibus tuis obsecuturum.

"Tuque etiam, gloriosissime Patriarcha sancte Ioseph, potenti tuo patrocinio nobis succurre, et Mariae manibus vota nostra Iesu Christo porrigenda submitte."

Si vero sodales, qui vel infirmitate vel alia causa impediti hanc Orationem recitare nequiverint, eandem indulgentiam lucrari poterunt, si devote quinquies recitaverint Orationem Dominicam, et Salutationem Angelicam cum Gloria Patri.

III.

Ducentorum dierum indulgentiam sodales Consociationis consequantur semel in die, si iaculatorias preces quocumque idiomate effuderint ut infra: "Jesu, Maria, Joseph, illuminate nos, succurrite nobis, salvate nos! Amen."

IV.

Centum dierum indulgentiam lucrifaciant sodales, qui operam dederint, ut Christianae Familiae huic piae et universali Consociationi sese adscribant.

V.

Indulgentiam sexaginta dierum lucrentur sodales, quoties hi: 1. In Ecclesia Parochiali, in qua sedem habet Consociatio sacrosancto Missae sacrificio, aliisque divinis officiis devote adstiterint: 2. vel quinquies recitaverint Orationem Dominicam et Salutationem Angelicam pro sodalibus defunctis: 3. vel familiarum dissidia composuerint, vel componenda curaverint: 4. vel Familias a iustitiae tramite devias, in viam salutis reducere studuerint: 5. vel pueros sive puellas christianis praeceptis imbuere satagerint: 6. vel aliud quodcumque pium opus peregerint, quod in bonum Consociationis cedat.

Sodalibus, si maluerint, omnibus et singulis indulgentiis supra dictis sive plenariis, sive partialibus labes poenasque defunctorum expiare liceat.

PRIVILEGIA.

Pro Sodalibus Universis.

Missae, quae pro sodalibus defunctis quocumque in altari celebrabuntur, iisdem suffragentur ac si in altari privilegiato celebrarentur.

Pro Parochis.

I.—Privilegium altaris personalis tribus in qualibet hebdomada diebus; dummodo simili privilegio alia de caussa non perfruantur.

II.—Facultas benedicendi extra Urbem Coronas, Rosaria, Cruces, Crucifixos, parvas statuas ac numismata, eisque applicandi omnes et singulas indulgentias, quas Summi Pontifices attribuere iisdem solent, ut describitur in apposito elencho; sed tantummodo exercenda pro sodalibus in Consociationem adscitis, die quo 1. christiani piam ingrediuntur Consociationem: et 2. sollemniter renovatur pactum Consociationis.

FORMULA.

RECITANDA QUOCUMQUE IDIOMATE A CHRISTIANIS FAMILIIS QUAE SE SACRAE FAMILIAE CONSECRANT.

"O Iesu Redemptor noster amabilissime, qui e caelo missus ut mundum doctrina et exemplo illustrares, maiorem mortalis tuae vitae partem in humili domo Nazarena traducere voluisti, Mariae et Iosepho subditus, illamque Familiam consecrasti, quae cunctis christianis familiis futura erat exemplo; nostram hanc domum, quae Tibi se totam nunc devovet, benignum suscipe. Tu illam protege et custodi, et sanctum tui timorem in ea confirma, una cum pace et concordia christianae caritatis: ut divino exemplari Familiae tuae similis fiat, omnesque ad unum quibus ea constat, beatitatis sempiternae sint compotes.

"O amantissima Iesu Christi Mater et mater nostra Maria, tua pietate et clementia fac ut consecrationem hanc nostram Iesus acceptam habeat, et sua nobis beneficia et benedictiones largiatur.

"O Ioseph, sanctissime Iesu et Mariae custos, in universis animae et corporis necessitatibus nobis tuis precibus succure; ut tecum una et beata Virgine Mariae aeternas divino Redemptori Iesu Christo laudes et gratias rependere possimus."

Atque haec omnia et singula, uti supra decreta sunt, ita firma, stabilia, rata in perpetuum esse volumus: non obstantibus Constitutionibus et Ordinationibus Apostolicis, ceterisque contrariis quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris, die XX Iunii anno MDCCCXCII. Pontificatus Nostri anno decimo quinto.

L. ✠ S. S. *Card.* VANNUTELLI.

DECRETUM.

DUBIA.

Postquam litterae a Sacra Rituum Congregatione, die 10 Decembris, 1890, de cultu Sacrae Familiae singularum Dioecesium Ordinariis transmissae fuerunt, eidem Sacrae Congregationi sequentia Dubia proposita sunt, nimirum:

I.—An Seminaria, Collegia, Congregationes et Religiosae Familiae possint per formulam novissime a Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leone Papa XIII approbatam semet Sacrae Familiae consecrare, itemque Paroeciae, Dioeceses ac Regiones?

II.—Preces ab eodem Sanctissimo Domino Nostro itidem approbatae atque indulgentiis ditatae a singulis Familiis coram imagine Sacrae Familiae recitandae, possuntne in Ecclesiis publicis usurpari?

III.—Licetne familiis, quae iam speciali ratione Sancto Ioseph se consecrarunt, semet Sacrae Familiae dedicare?

IV.—Quum permultae orationes, litaniae, formulae consecrationis Sacrae Familiae et alia huiusmodi in pluribus locis circumferantur, quomodo providendum?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio in Ordinario Coetu ad Vaticanum subsignata die coadunata, referente me infrascripto Cardinali Praefecto, omnibus rite perpensis, sic rescribere rata est :

Ad I.—Quoad Seminaria, Collegia et singulas Dumos Congregationum ac Familiarum Religiosarum, *Affirmative*; quoad Paroecias, provisum per consecrationem familiarum in singulis Paroeciis; quoad cetera *Non expedire :*

Ad II.—*Affirmative*, sed coram Imagine Sacrae Familiae.

Ad III.—*Affirmative.*

Ad IV.—Quoad litanias, comprehendi sub universali vetito Litaniarum, quae explicite approbatae non fuerint a Sede Apostolica ; quoad orationes, formulas consecrationis aliasque preces sub quovis titulo ad Sacram Familiam honorandum ahibitas, mittendas esse ab Ordinariis locorum, nec non a Superioribus Religiosarum Congregationum, ut debito examini subiiciantur ; secus in posterum licite usurpari nequeant. Die 13 Februarii, 1892.

De hls autem facta Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leoni Papae XIII per me infrascriptum Cardinalem Praefectum relatione, Sanctitas sua resolutiones Sacrae eiusdem Congregationis ratas habuit, et confirmavit. Die 18, iisdem mense et anno.

L. ✠ S. CAI. *Card.* ALOISI MASELLA, *R. C. S. Praefectus.*
VINCENTIO NUSSI, *S. R. C. Secretarius.*

BOOK REVIEW.

SOCIALISM. By Rev. Victor Cathrein, S. J., from the fifth German edition, by Rev. James Conway, S. J., pp. 104, 12° cloth, 0.75. Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati and Chicago. 1892.

The book of F. Cathrein on "Socialism, its Fundamental Principles and its Practicability" is substantially taken from an important treatise on "Moral Philosophy," by the same author. The reason why this interesting monograph has been cut out from the greater work and printed separately, hardly needs an explanation: comparatively few persons have time enough to search every part of the ethical field, but there are some points that claim the attention of all. The rapid advance of socialism, the earnestness of its supporters, the magnitude of the issues involved, make it a matter of paramount importance for the defenders of society to know the nature and the extent of the danger which threatens its existence.

The author has not attempted to describe all the forms of socialism; an exhaustive treatise, such as Rae's "Contemporary Socialism," would fail to reach the great mass of the reading public: he has wisely preferred carefully to analyze the "quintessence" of the system, as formulated by Schäffle, advocated by Karl Marx, and made popular by Herr Bebel. The reader will not find in this volume the professorial socialism of Adolph Wagner, or the Land-socialism of de Laveleye. The former is confined to colleges and universities, the latter was already refuted in a serial which has been translated by Rev. J. U. Heinzle, and published in pamphlet form under the title of "The Champions of Agrarian Socialism."[1]

The politico-economic system so thoroughly demonstrated in the present work, is stated clearly enough in the programmes adopted by the socialist leaders at the meetings held in Gotha (1875), Baltimore (1883), Cincinnati (1885), Paris (1889) and Erfurt (1891). From these programmes copious quotations will be found in the book, and the passages selected fairly represent the living socialism of to-day; it is with this live and aggressive socialism, and not with the collectivism of scientific dreamers, that F. Cathrein has joined issue. His work is divided into three chapters, each one containing several sections: from the first line to the last, directness and perspicuity are conspicuous; and no special scientific training is needed to understand everything contained in its pages.

In the first chapter the author makes us acquainted with the nature of socialism, its relationship with communism, and its historical evolution. In the second, he shows the unsoundness of its religious, ethical and economical assumptions. He proves that the theory of value which is the basis of the famous work of Marx on Capital is utterly untenable. And yet, some

1 Peter Paul and Bros., Buffalo, 1889.

economists, reputed orthodox, have repeated after the German socialist that labor is the only source of wealth, and that the labor-hour is both the unit and the standard of value. The iron law of wages receives its due share of attention, and it is clearly shown that liberalism, which once took up *Laissez faire* as a watch word, and adopted unlimited industrial competition as the only sound financial policy, has really rivetted the chains of the workman, brought about centralization, and paved the way to socialism.

The third chapter will be found most instructive. It deals with the impracticability of collectivism: "This form of socialism," says the author, "comprises the most numerous and influential opponents of the existing social order, and in the mind of its defenders has most prospects of realization because it embodies the most rational and the most systematic plan of social revolution." Collectivists imagine that they have found in a federation of communities a check for the tyranny of State absolutism, but Schäffle tells them that they may call *central committee* what other people call *a State* but the result will be the same: "The only system of socialism imaginable is and will continue to be central organization, universal and exclusive collective production by the social democracy." Not only does this organization present insuperable difficulties, but it makes progress, nay subsistence itself, next to impossible, because it takes away the most powerful incentive to production and improvement. Herr Bebel comes forward with the most liberal promises. He is of opinion "that such an organization of labor, based on perfect freedom and equality . . . . would awaken the highest consciousness of solidarity, would beget a spirit of joyous industry and emulation, such as is nowhere to be found in the industrial system of our day." Schäffle does not believe in this golden dream; "This consciousness," says the prosaic professor, "cannot exercise sufficient control, does not, at least, overcome the tendency to idleness and dishonesty, does not hinder cheating the community in regard to labor, time, etc. . . . Socialism would have to engage each one's private interest at least as strongly for the collective production as is the case in private production."

The division of the produce is another insoluble problem. What consideration will guide the central committee in distributing the communal wealth among the families of workmen? The number of persons? The labor time? The quantity produced by each individual? Personal merit? Diligence? The wants of the individuals? All these standards are tried and found wanting. Moreover, socialistic organization deals a fatal blow to the unity and sanctity of the households; all make children the property of the State, and throw on the State the rights and responsibility of education. Programmes are unanimous on this point—let us quote but one, that of Gotha. "The socialistic labor party of Germany demands . . . universal and equal education of the people by the State; *universal compulsory education*; [1] free instruction in all educational institutions. *Religion to be declared a private matter.*" The last section of the third chapter

1 Italics ours.

contains an answer to the objections raised by the socialists. It is followed by a brief conclusion in which the author brings to a focus the principles upheld in the preceding chapters.

The importance of the topics discussed in this clear and compendious volume, the great success which it has achieved in Germany and elsewhere.[1] and the reputation of its author, make words of commendation superfluous; but we may be allowed to say that the work has been translated by a well-known writer in full sympathy with the author. In its English dress it is thoroughly naturalized, and does not look at all like a foreign importation. We hope that the complete treatise of F. Cathrein on Moral Philosophy will soon be introduced to the English public by the same interpreter.

INSTRUCTIO SPONSORUM lingua anglica conscripta ad usum Parochorum auctore sacerdote missionario.—Third Edition. B. Herder: St. Louis, Mo., 1892. Pr. o. 30.

This is a valuable little treatise which cannot fail to be of great advantage to priests on the mission. The subject matter contained in it demands almost constant attention, and yet it is of such delicate nature in some respects that only the most thoughtful treatment can insure a proper appreciation of it on the part of those who assume the married state, often quite unconscious of its attendant responsibilities.

We have here a clear, accurate and readable English exposition, by a man who was both theologian and pastor of souls, of the essential knowledge which every man or woman about to marry should have concerning their respective duties as husband or wife, and parent.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THOUGHTS AND TEACHINGS OF LACORDAIRE. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Co. 1892.

INSTITUTIONEN DES KATHOLISCHEN KIRCHENRECHTS. von Dr. Hugo Laemmer. II Edit. Freiburg im Breisgau.—B. Herder. 1892. St. Louis, Mo.

LITURGIA SACRAMENTORUM ex praescripto Ritualis Romani servanda. Auctore Sac. Jo. Bapt. Pighi, D. S. Th.—Veronae: Felix Cinquetti.

LITURGIA SACRAMENTALIUM. Eodem auctore, etc.

ATLAS HISTORIQUE ET GEOGRAPHIQUE DE LA BIBLE. Par le Dr. Richard de Riess. Dix cartes coloriees. Deuxième édition augmentée avec un vocabulaire.—Fribourg en Brisgau.—B. Herder. 1892. St. Louis, Mo.

1 Translations have already appeared in French, Italian, Spanish, Polish and Flemish.

economists, reputed orthodox, have repeated after the German socialist that labor is the only source of wealth, and that the labor-hour is both the unit and the standard of value. The iron law of wages receives its due share of attention, and it is clearly shown that liberalism, which once took up *Laissez faire* as a watch word, and adopted unlimited industrial competition as the only sound financial policy, has really rivetted the chains of the workman, brought about centralization, and paved the way to socialism.

The third chapter will be found most instructive. It deals with the impracticability of collectivism: "This form of socialism," says the author, "comprises the most numerous and influential opponents of the existing social order, and in the mind of its defenders has most prospects of realization because it embodies the most rational and the most systematic plan of social revolution." Collectivists imagine that they have found in a federation of communities a check for the tyranny of State absolutism, but Schäffle tells them that they may call *central committee* what other people call *a State* but the result will be the same: "The only system of socialism imaginable is and will continue to be central organization, universal and exclusive collective production by the social democracy." Not only does this organization present insuperable difficulties, but it makes progress, nay subsistence itself, next to impossible, because it takes away the most powerful incentive to production and improvement. Herr Bebel comes forward with the most liberal promises. He is of opinion "that such an organization of labor, based on perfect freedom and equality . . . . would awaken the highest consciousness of solidarity, would beget a spirit of joyous industry and emulation, such as is nowhere to be found in the industrial system of our day." Schäffle does not believe in this golden dream: "This consciousness," says the prosaic professor, "cannot exercise sufficient control, does not, at least, overcome the tendency to idleness and dishonesty, does not hinder cheating the community in regard to labor, time, etc. . . . Socialism would have to engage each one's private interest at least as strongly for the collective production as is the case in private production."

The division of the produce is another insoluble problem. What consideration will guide the central committee in distributing the communal wealth among the families of workmen? The number of persons? The labor time? The quantity produced by each individual? Personal merit? Diligence? The wants of the individuals? All these standards are tried and found wanting. Moreover, socialistic organization deals a fatal blow to the unity and sanctity of the households; all make children the property of the State, and throw on the State the rights and responsibility of education. Programmes are unanimous on this point—let us quote but one, that of Gotha. "The socialistic labor party of Germany demands . . . universal and equal education of the people by the State; *universal compulsory education*; [1] free instruction in all educational institutions. *Religion to be declared a private matter.*" The last section of the third chapter

1 Italics ours.

contains an answer to the objections raised by the socialists. It is followed by a brief conclusion in which the author brings to a focus the principles upheld in the preceding chapters.

The importance of the topics discussed in this clear and compendious volume, the great success which it has achieved in Germany and elsewhere,[1] and the reputation of its author, make words of commendation superfluous; but we may be allowed to say that the work has been translated by a well-known writer in full sympathy with the author. In its English dress it is thoroughly naturalized, and does not look at all like a foreign importation. We hope that the complete treatise of F. Cathrein on Moral Philosophy will soon be introduced to the English public by the same interpreter.

INSTRUCTIO SPONSORUM lingua anglica conscripta ad usum Parochorum auctore sacerdote missionario.—Third Edition. B. Herder: St. Louis, Mo., 1892. Pr. o. 30.

This is a valuable little treatise which cannot fail to be of great advantage to priests on the mission. The subject matter contained in it demands almost constant attention, and yet it is of such delicate nature in some respects that only the most thoughtful treatment can insure a proper appreciation of it on the part of those who assume the married state, often quite unconscious of its attendant responsibilities.

We have here a clear, accurate and readable English exposition, by a man who was both theologian and pastor of souls, of the essential knowledge which every man or woman about to marry should have concerning their respective duties as husband or wife, and parent.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THOUGHTS AND TEACHINGS OF LACORDAIRE. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Co. 1892.

INSTITUTIONEN DES KATHOLISCHEN KIRCHENRECHTS. von Dr. Hugo Laemmer. II Edit. Freiburg im Breisgau.—B. Herder. 1892. St. Louis, Mo.

LITURGIA SACRAMENTORUM ex praescripto Ritualis Romani servanda. Auctore Sac. Jo. Bapt. Pighi, D. S. Th.—Veronae: Felix Cinquetti.

LITURGIA SACRAMENTALIUM. Eodem auctore, etc.

ATLAS HISTORIQUE ET GEOGRAPHIQUE DE LA BIBLE. Par le Dr. Richard de Riess. Dix cartes coloriees. Deuxième édition augmentée avec un vocabulaire.—Fribourg en Brisgau.—B. Herder. 1892. St. Louis, Mo.

1 Translations have already appeared in French, Italian, Spanish, Polish and Flemish.